



SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF  
TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING  
40th session  
Agenda item 14

STW 40/14  
23 February 2009  
Original: ENGLISH

## REPORT TO THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Table of contents

	<b>Page</b>
1 GENERAL	3
2 DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES	5
3 VALIDATION OF MODEL TRAINING COURSES	7
4 UNLAWFUL PRACTICES ASSOCIATED WITH CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY	8
5 TRAINING FOR SEAFARER SAFETY REPRESENTATIVES	9
6 CASUALTY ANALYSIS	10
7 COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE STCW CONVENTION AND THE STCW CODE	11
8 REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPLES FOR ESTABLISHING THE SAFE MANNING LEVELS OF SHIPS	44
9 MEASURES TO ENHANCE MARITIME SECURITY	49
10 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR DETERMINING SAFE MANNING	50
11 WORK PROGRAMME AND AGENDA FOR STW 41	50
12 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2010	51
13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS	51
14 REPORT TO THE COMMITTEES	54

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly asked to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.



**LIST OF ANNEXES**

- ANNEX 1            PRELIMINARY REVISED DRAFT TEXT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON STANDARDS OF TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING FOR SEAFARERS (STCW), 1978, AS AMENDED
- ANNEX 2            PRELIMINARY REVISED DRAFT TEXT OF PART A OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE
- ANNEX 3            PRELIMINARY REVISED DRAFT TEXT OF PART B OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE
- ANNEX 4            TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE INTERSESSIONAL MEETING OF THE STW WORKING GROUP
- ANNEX 5            PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES OF SAFE MANNING (RESOLUTION (A.890(21), AS AMENDED)
- ANNEX 6            DRAFT REVISED WORK PROGRAMME OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR STW 41
- ANNEX 7            STATUS OF PLANNED OUTPUT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL ACTION PLAN OF THE ORGANIZATION AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 2008-2009 BIENNIUM RELEVANT TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE

## 1 GENERAL

1.1 The Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) held its fortieth session from 2 to 6 February 2009 under the chairmanship of Rear Admiral Peter Brady (Jamaica). The Vice-Chairman, Mr. A.H. Kayssi (Lebanon), was also present.

1.2 The session was attended by representatives from the following countries:

ALGERIA	KUWAIT
ANGOLA	LATVIA
ARGENTINA	LEBANON
AUSTRALIA	LIBERIA
BAHAMAS	LITHUANIA
BELGIUM	LUXEMBOURG
BELIZE	MALAYSIA
BRAZIL	MALTA
BULGARIA	MARSHALL ISLANDS
CANADA	MEXICO
CHILE	NETHERLANDS
CHINA	NEW ZEALAND
COLOMBIA	NIGERIA
CÔTE D'IVOIRE	NORWAY
CROATIA	PANAMA
CYPRUS	PERU
CZECH REPUBLIC	PHILIPPINES
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA	POLAND
DENMARK	PORTUGAL
DOMINICA	QATAR
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	REPUBLIC OF KOREA
ECUADOR	ROMANIA
EGYPT	RUSSIAN FEDERATION
ESTONIA	SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS
FINLAND	SAUDI ARABIA
FRANCE	SINGAPORE
GERMANY	SOUTH AFRICA
GHANA	SPAIN
GREECE	SWEDEN
HONDURAS	SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC
ICELAND	THAILAND
INDIA	TURKEY
INDONESIA	TUVALU
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)	UKRAINE
IRELAND	UNITED KINGDOM
ISRAEL	UNITED STATES
ITALY	URUGUAY
JAMAICA	VANUATU
JAPAN	VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)
KENYA	

and the following Associate Members of IMO:

FAROE ISLANDS (DENMARK)  
HONG KONG, CHINA

1.3 The following specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were also represented:

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO)  
EUROPEAN COMMISSION (EC)  
MARITIME ORGANIZATION FOR WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICA (MOWCA)  
LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES  
INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF SHIPPING (ICS)  
INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING FEDERATION (ISF)  
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MARINE INSURANCE (IUMI)  
INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION (ITF)  
INTERNATIONAL RADIO MARITIME COMMITTEE (CIRM)  
BIMCO  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLASSIFICATION SOCIETIES (IACS)  
OIL COMPANIES INTERNATIONAL MARINE FORUM (OCIMF)  
INTERNATIONAL MARITIME PILOTS' ASSOCIATION (IMPA)  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DRILLING CONTRACTORS (IADC)  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSTITUTES OF NAVIGATION (IAIN)  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MARITIME UNIVERSITIES (IAMU)  
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SHIPMASTERS' ASSOCIATIONS (IFSMA)  
INTERNATIONAL LIFESAVING APPLIANCES MANUFACTURERS'  
ASSOCIATION (ILAMA)  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT TANKER OWNERS  
(INTERTANKO)  
SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL GAS TANKER AND TERMINAL OPERATORS  
LIMITED (SIGTTO)  
CRUISE LINES INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION (CLIA)  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DRY CARGO SHIPOWNERS  
(INTERCARGO)  
INTERNATIONAL MARITIME LECTURERS ASSOCIATION (IMLA)  
THE INSTITUTE OF MARINE ENGINEERING, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
(IMarEST)  
INTERNATIONAL PARCEL TANKERS ASSOCIATION (IPTA)  
THE INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION (IMCA)  
INTERNATIONAL SHIP MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION (InterManager)  
INTERNATIONAL HARBOUR MASTERS' ASSOCIATION (IHMA)  
INTERNATIONAL MARITIME HEALTH ASSOCIATION (IMHA)  
GLOBALMET

### **Secretary-General's opening address**

1.4 The Secretary-General welcomed the participants and delivered his opening address, the full text of which is reproduced in document STW 40/INF.3.

### **Chairman's remarks**

1.5 In response, the Chairman thanked the Secretary-General for his words of guidance, encouragement and advice. In particular, he thanked the Secretary-General for the steps taken relating to:

- .1 the launch of the "Go to Sea" campaign jointly by IMO, the round table of shipping and ITF, which would go a long way towards attracting young persons to take up a career at sea and address the present shortage of officers to man ships engaged in international trade; and
- .2 address acts of piracy off the coasts of Somalia and the Gulf of Aden. He assured the Secretary-General that his request on this matter would be discussed in depth after the establishment of the working groups for this session.

He further assured the Secretary-General that his advice and requests on other matters would also be given every consideration in the deliberations of the Sub-Committee and its working groups.

He stressed that the Sub-Committee had before it a demanding and challenging session. In spite of that and given the successful history of the Sub-Committee in producing sound and robust international legislation and guidance pertinent to training, certification and watchkeeping, in an efficient way, he was confident that the same spirit would prevail at this session.

1.6 The delegation of the United States, referring to the extraordinary performance of the captain and crew of US Airways flight 1549 which had to ditch on the Hudson River in an emergency, highlighted the exceptional performance of all ships and their crew who responded immediately and spontaneously to that incident. He stressed that the coordinated efforts amidst swift current and freezing temperatures ensured that every passenger and crew member was able to reach ashore safely. In their opinion, this event highlighted the professionalism and experience of every mariner serving in and around New York City.

1.7 The delegation of Portugal informed the Sub-Committee that M.V. **Braga**, a Portuguese flagged ship, encountered strong winds and heavy seas off La Coruña in the north coast of Spain and in spite of all the efforts of the crew had to be abandoned. All the crew members were rescued by SASEMAR, the authority responsible for SAR operations in Spain. He expressed Portugal's deepest gratitude and invited the delegation of Spain to convey the same to SASEMAR, which the delegation of Spain agreed to convey.

### **Adoption of the agenda and related matters**

1.8 The Sub-Committee adopted the agenda (STW 40/1) and agreed, in general, that the work of the Sub-Committee should be guided by the annotations to the provisional agenda and the timetable (STW 40/1/1), as amended. The agenda of the session, including a list of documents submitted under each agenda item, is given in STW 40/INF.4

## **2 DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES**

### **OUTCOME OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH AND EIGHTY-FIFTH SESSIONS OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE**

2.1 The Sub-Committee was informed (STW 40/2 and Add.1) of the decisions and comments pertaining to its work of the eighty-fourth and eighty-fifth sessions of the Maritime Safety

Committee. The actions taken by the Sub-Committee, with respect to the decisions and comments of MSC 84 and MSC 85 on items related to its work are reported under the relevant agenda items.

### **Communication of information**

2.2 The Committee had received the Secretary-General's report on two STCW Parties pursuant to STCW regulation I/7; had confirmed that the procedures for assessment of information had been followed correctly in respect of that Party, and had issued MSC/Circ.1163/Rev.3 on Parties to the STCW Convention confirmed by the Committee at its eighty-fourth session as having demonstrated to be giving "full and complete effect" to the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention, as amended.

2.3 The Committee had received the Secretary-General's reports on seven STCW Parties pursuant to STCW regulation I/8; had confirmed that the procedures for assessment of information had been followed correctly and had issued MSC/Circ.1164/Rev.5 on Promulgation of information related to reports of independent evaluation submitted by Parties to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978, as amended, confirmed by the Maritime Safety Committee to have communicated information which demonstrated that Parties are giving full and complete effect to the relevant provisions of the Convention.

### **Approval of competent persons**

2.4 The Committee had approved additional competent persons nominated by Governments, as listed in the annex to MSC/Circ.797/Rev.17.

### **Number of meeting groups**

2.5 MSC 84 had noted (MSC 84/2/3, paragraph 18) that, at MEPC 57, the delegation of the Bahamas, supported by several delegations, had expressed the concern that the Committees' Guidelines were not being adhered to and that the increased number of working, drafting, technical and correspondence groups, including intersessional meetings, resulted in unrealistic timescales and priorities being allocated to work programme items as well as taxing the resources of Member Governments, in particular, the developing and least developed countries, as well as the Secretariat. In this context, the Committee noted that the Chairmen's meeting had reiterated the recommendations of its last meeting, which MSC 83 and MEPC 57 had agreed to, that:

- .1 intersessional working groups and technical groups should not be held at the same time as Committee or sub-committee meetings; and
- .2 splinter groups of a working group, if established, should meet outside normal working hours.

MSC 84 had further noted the recommendation of the meeting that the agenda management procedures specified in the Committees' Guidelines should be strictly adhered to and this will reduce the need for various groups at a meeting as well as intersessional meetings.

### **Format and procedure for reporting of planned outputs by the sub-committees**

2.6 MSC 84 had agreed that the sub-committees, at each respective session, should prepare and annex to their respective reports, a report on the status of their planned outputs in the High-level Action Plan for the respective biennium in the format proposed in the annex to document STW 39/WP.1, for the Committee's consideration and endorsement and regarding the terminologies to be used to describe the status of the planned outputs, the term "ongoing" should not be used and actual progress of work must be reflected and, in addition, the status of work on the long-term work programmes should also be provided.

### **DECISIONS OF OTHER SUB-COMMITTEES**

2.7 The Sub-Committee was also informed (STW 40/2/1) of the decisions and comments pertaining to its work of DE 51 and NAV 54. The actions taken by the Sub-Committee with respect to these decisions and comments thereon are reported under the relevant agenda items.

## **3 VALIDATION OF MODEL TRAINING COURSES**

3.1 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by the Secretariat (STW 40/3) on the status of production of model courses and the progress made with their translation into French and Spanish. According to updated information provided by the Secretariat 34 model courses had been translated into French and 38 model courses had been translated into Spanish. Of these translated model courses, 31 had been published in French and 33 in Spanish. The rest were in the process of production and would be available shortly. The translation of the other courses was being undertaken in a phased manner as reported earlier.

### **IMO model course 1.34 on Automatic Identification Systems**

3.2 The Sub-Committee was informed (STW 40/3/1) that NAV 54 had noted that, following the entry into force of the 2004 amendments to MARPOL Annex II on 1 January 2007, the number of pollution categories to be reported remained the same (4) and had agreed that, as a cargo re-evaluation had led to a substantive change from an operational perspective, there was a need to make the users aware of the fact that the categories nomenclature A, B, C and D had been changed to X, Y, Z and OS. Accordingly, NAV 54 had revised SN/Circ.227 on Guidelines for the installation of a Shipborne Automatic Identification System (AIS). Furthermore, NAV 54 had also noted that there was a need to update the IMO model course 1.34 on Automatic Identification Systems. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee agreed that the drafting group proposed to be established, should review IMO model course 1.34 on Automatic Identification Systems following the entry into force of the 2004 amendments to MARPOL Annex II on 1 January 2007 and advise the Sub-Committee as appropriate.

### **Review of model courses related to the implementation of the STCW Convention and Code**

3.3 GlobalMET (STW 40/3/2) informed the Sub-Committee of their offer, through its extensive network of training institutes worldwide, to undertake the review and update the model courses related to the STCW Convention and Code in a phased manner after the completion of the comprehensive review and adoption of the corresponding amendments.

3.4 In this context, the observers from IAMU and IMLA also offered the services of their members to assist in the review and revision of the model courses.

3.5 The delegations of the United Kingdom and United States cautioned the Sub-Committee so as to avoid entrusting the review/revision of the model courses exclusively to only one organization.

3.6 The Sub-Committee expressed appreciation to GlobalMET, IAMU and IMLA for their offer and concurred with their proposals.

### **Establishment of a drafting group**

3.7 The Sub-Committee established a drafting group and instructed it, taking into account the comments made in plenary, to:

- .1 review IMO model course 1.34 on Automatic Identification Systems following the entry into force of the 2004 amendments to MARPOL Annex II on 1 January 2007 and advise the Sub-Committee, as appropriate;
- .2 review the list of model courses related to the STCW Convention and, in light of the ongoing comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code, identify those courses that would need to be revised and prepare a plan for the revision in a phased manner; and
- .3 report to plenary on Thursday, 5 February 2009.

### **Report of the drafting group**

3.8 On receipt of the report of the drafting group (STW 40/WP.5), the Sub-Committee validated the amendments to model course 1.34, as set out in annex 1 to document STW 40/WP.5, and instructed the Secretariat to publish them as soon as possible.

3.9 The Sub-Committee identified model courses expected to be revised consequent to the completion of the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code and prepared a proposed plan for review/revision, as set out in annex 2 to document STW 40/WP.5.

## **4 UNLAWFUL PRACTICES ASSOCIATED WITH CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY**

### **Reports on fraudulent certificates reported to the Secretariat**

4.1 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by the Secretariat (STW 40/4 and addenda), detailing fraudulent certificates found on board ships during inspections or reportedly being used, as reported to the Secretariat for the year 2008 and urged Member Governments to report details of fraudulent certificates detected in the revised reporting format (STW 38/17, annex 1).

4.2 The Sub-Committee also noted the oral information provided by the Secretariat that the certification verification facility through the IMO website had been used 10,725 times during the year 2008.

## **5 TRAINING FOR SEAFARER SAFETY REPRESENTATIVES**

5.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 82, following consideration of document MSC 82/21/2 (New Zealand, South Africa and the Philippines) in the context of the FSI Sub-Committee's work programme, had agreed to include in the Sub-Committee's work programme, a high-priority item "Training for seafarer safety representatives", with two sessions needed to complete the item and had instructed the Sub-Committee to include the item in the provisional agenda for STW 39.

5.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 39 had agreed to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element relating to amendments to the ISM Code before finalizing the training requirements for a ship's seafarer safety representative. In this context, the Sub-Committee noted that MSC 84 had noted that several delegations expressed the view that, although there might be a need for including the requirements for a seafarer safety representative in the ISM Code, they had concerns relating to:

- .1 small ships with small crews;
- .2 ships with multi-ethnic crews;
- .3 training;
- .4 the relationship with the role of shipboard safety officer; and
- .5 the relationship with the master.

Accordingly, MSC 84 had agreed that the proposal should be reconsidered at the next session of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element.

5.3 ITF (STW 40/5) provided a draft outline of the duties and responsibilities of a Ship Safety Representative (SSR) and the Knowledge, Understanding and Proficiency (KUP) requirements for a ship safety representative to successfully perform in that capacity and proposed that the Sub-Committee should define the duties and responsibilities of the SSR and provide guidance to flag States relating to training of the SSR.

5.4 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the opinion that training requirements for SSRs should be applicable to experienced seafarers only and should not form part of an initial educational training and that such provisions should be developed in the form of guidance either in part B of the STCW Code or an MSC circular. Furthermore, they were of the opinion that it would be prudent to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element relating to the inclusion of SSR in the ISM Code.

5.5 The delegation of Uruguay expressed concerns relating to paragraph 3.2 in document STW 40/5 and suggested that this provision should be deleted and instead the SSR should be proposed by the master to the crew members.

5.6 The delegation from Norway, supported by others, expressed concerns on the proposal, as it was not clear what exactly was being proposed.

5.7 The observer from INTERTANKO requested a clarification as to what ITF was exactly proposing since paragraph 4.2 of document STW 40/5 referred to the appropriate level of training for guidance to flag States, whereas, in the annexed table it was shown as “mandatory”.

5.8 The observer from ITF clarified that the training requirements were for guidance only.

5.9 The delegation of Chile expressed the opinion that the proposal by ITF was, in principle, both interesting and important. However, they had some doubts relating to the direct access that the SSR may have to the designated person (DP), as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the proposal. Furthermore, they also supported the Netherlands in that the SSR person should be an experienced crew member and should not be elected by the crew.

5.10 The delegation of Spain expressed the opinion that any such requirements should not undermine the Master’s authority.

5.11 The delegation of the Philippines recalled that the original intention was to amend the ISM Code with a view to align it with the MLC 2006 and suggested that at this stage it was premature to make any decision until the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element and the Committee had taken the relevant decision thereon.

5.12 The delegation of Germany recalled that STW 39 had agreed to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element and that the MSC had not taken a decision to include SSRs in the ISM Code. Hence, it would be appropriate to wait until the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element had completed its work and to invite the Committee to extend the target completion date. This was supported by the Sub-Committee.

5.13 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee agreed to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element scheduled to be convened at MEPC 59 and to invite both Committees to note the Sub-Committee’s ongoing discussions on the issue with a view to MEPC 59 referring the outcome of the consideration of that group on the matter and its own decision thereon directly to STW 41 to enable the Sub-Committee to consider relevant training requirements for SSR, if required, and extend the target completion date to 2010 (see agenda item 11).

## **6 CASUALTY ANALYSIS**

6.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 77 (MSC 77/26, paragraph 18.10) had decided that the item on “Casualty analysis” should remain on the work programme of the sub-committees. This decision was reaffirmed by MSC 78 (MSC 78/26, paragraph 24.8).

6.2 The Sub-Committee noted that, at this session, no documents had been either submitted for consideration or referred to it by either the FSI Sub-Committee or any other technical body of the Organization for review, and consequently agreed to defer further consideration of the item to STW 41.

## **7 COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE STCW CONVENTION AND THE STCW CODE**

### **7.1 GENERAL**

7.1.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 81, following the invitation by STW 37, had included a high-priority item on “Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code”, with a target completion date of 2008, instructing the Sub-Committee to define, as a first step, the issues to be reviewed and to advise the Committee accordingly, before embarking on the actual work, for the Committee to endorse the scope of the review of the instruments; and, as a second step, following the Committee’s endorsement, the Sub-Committee would undertake the authorized review in a systematic and organized manner; and
- .2 STW 38 had identified, and MSC 83 had approved, the list of areas in the STCW Convention and Code identified for the comprehensive review and instructed the Sub-Committee to undertake the proposed review accordingly in a systematic and organized manner and extended the target completion date to 2010.

7.1.2 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 84 had:

- .1 noted the progress of work relating to the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code;
- .2 noted and agreed, in principle, to the proposal to hold a conference to adopt amendments to the STCW Convention and the STCW Code emanating from the comprehensive review and to advise C 100 accordingly;
- .3 agreed to the schedule of meetings relating to the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code, as set out in annex 1 to document STW 39/12; and
- .4 approved the convening of an *ad hoc* intersessional working group in September 2008 to progress work on the comprehensive review.

7.1.3 The Sub-Committee noted further that MSC 84, had approved the list of areas where training cannot be conducted on board and instructed the Sub-Committee to consider measures to ensure compliance with the requirements in the STCW Convention, to maintain professional competence in these areas.

### **Report of the *ad hoc* Intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.1.4 The Sub-Committee approved the report of the *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code (STW 40/7/3) in general and, in particular:

- .1 invited the Committee to instruct NAV 55 to review SOLAS regulation V/19.2.2.2 relating to the carriage of a daylight signalling lamp and, annex IV of COLREGs and appendix 1 of the International Code of Signals prescribing the distress signal SOS to be sent by a signalling lamp with a view to deleting the training requirements relating to visual signalling by Morse Code in the STCW Convention and provide its advice to STW 41;
- .2 noted that the Group had agreed that the preliminary revised draft text of the various chapters of the STCW Convention and Code should be submitted for further consideration under the corresponding sub-item of the agenda;
- .3 agreed that for a better balance of workload, the working group considering chapters I, II, and III should also consider chapter VII;
- .4 approved the terms of reference for the working groups to be established at STW 40 under agenda item 7; and
- .5 agreed that the plenary should only consider issues requiring a decision in principle, so that the working groups could start their work using the preliminary revised draft text prepared by the Group so as to provide them with maximum working time.

### **Establishment of the working groups**

7.1.5 The Sub-Committee formally established Working Group (WG 1) to consider the comprehensive review of chapters I, II, III and VII of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code with the following terms of reference:

Taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, in particular on issues of principles, the Working Group should consider relevant proposals in documents submitted under agenda items 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.7 and:

- .1 review the preliminary revised draft text of chapters I, II, and III of the STCW Convention and part A and part B of the STCW Code, as prepared by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code and make further progress on the draft text of amendments with a view to endorsement by plenary and approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41;
- .2 review the preliminary revised draft text of chapter VII of the STCW Convention, part A and part B of the STCW Code, as prepared by STW 39 and make further progress on the draft text of amendments with a view to endorsement by plenary and approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41,

and submit its report to the plenary on Thursday, 5 February 2009.

7.1.6 The Sub-Committee formally established Working Group (WG 2) to consider the comprehensive review of chapters IV, V, VI and VIII with the following terms of reference:

Taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, in particular on issues of principles, the Working Group should consider relevant proposals in documents submitted under agenda items 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.8 and:

- .1 review the preliminary revised draft text of chapters V, VI and VIII of the STCW Convention and part A and part B of the STCW Code, as prepared by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code and make further progress on the draft text of amendments with a view to endorsement by plenary and approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41;
- .2 review the preliminary revised draft text of chapter IV of the STCW Convention, part A and part B of the STCW Code, as prepared by STW 39 and make further progress on the draft text of amendments with a view to endorsement by plenary and approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41,

and submit its report to the plenary on Thursday, 5 February 2009.

7.1.7 Before releasing the working groups, the Sub-Committee considered those proposals which needed a decision in principle before referring them to the relevant working group, as set out in the ensuing paragraphs. All those proposals which did not require a principle decision were referred directly to the relevant working group.

## **7.2 CHAPTER I – GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Regulation I/1 (Definitions and clarifications)**

7.2.1 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/10 and STW 40/7/30) proposed:

- .1 definitions for the terms “Certificate of competency”, “Issuing/Maritime administration” and “GMDSS radio operator”;
- .2 to harmonize the terminologies being used for certificate/document; to review section B-I/2 in order to specify the minimum information that a certificate should contain; and
- .3 to replace the term “Appropriate certificate” with the term “Certificate of competency” in chapters I, II, III, IV and VII.

7.2.2 OCIMF and INTERTANKO (STW 40/7/31) suggested amendments to proposed regulation 1/1.4 to ensure that certificates under chapter V are issued by Administrations only and that certificates under chapter VI may be issued by the Administration or under its authority.

7.2.3 Japan (STW 40/7/50) proposed an amended definition for the term “propulsion power”.

7.2.4 The Sub-Committee agreed that this regulation be considered after the completion of the comprehensive review so that all the definitions identified could be considered together.

### **Regulation I/2 (Certificates and endorsements)**

7.2.5 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/10) submitted a proposal on the minimum information that should be included in a certificate.

7.2.6 India (STW 40/7/22) proposed the transfer of provisions related to the issue and registration of certificates from regulation I/9 to regulation I/2.

7.2.7 Japan (STW 40/7/51) proposed that the duration of the window period for revalidation should be determined by Administrations.

7.2.8 The Sub-Committee, noting that these proposals did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred them to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Regulation I/3 (Principles governing near-coastal voyages)**

7.2.9 The Sub-Committee recalled that the *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code had deferred the decision relating to the issue of agreements proposed under this regulation. In this context, the delegation of Germany clarified that the proposed agreements were not of a formal nature, instead it would follow the same principles as in regulation I/10. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee agreed that the WG 1 should take this into account when finalizing the text.

### **Regulation I/6 (Training and assessment)**

7.2.10 CLIA (STW 40/7/66) expressed the view that the proposed text unduly restricted the Administrations from recognizing distance learning and e-learning programmes developed by shipping companies or independent subject matter experts. Accordingly, CLIA proposed the deletion of the words “Maritime Education and Training establishment” from the proposed section B-I/6, paragraphs 7.1 and 11.1.

7.2.11 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Regulation I/7 (Communication of information)**

7.2.12 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/42) proposed additional text to be included in section A-I/7, as appropriate, to ensure that the competent persons evaluate reports submitted under regulation I/8 and express their views in writing to enable the Secretary-General to make his report to the Maritime Safety Committee.

7.2.13 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Regulation I/9 (Medical standards – Issue and registration of certificates)**

7.2.14 Consequential to its proposal under regulation I/2, India (STW 40/7/22) proposed to transfer certain sections of STCW regulation I/9 and the associated sections in the STCW Code to STCW regulation I/2, as agreed at the *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code.

7.2.15 IMHA (STW 40/7/26) proposed amendments to sections A-I/9 and B-I/9 of the STCW Code relating to international standards of medical fitness for seafarers.

7.2.16 The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by others, appreciated the proposal by IMHA and agreed that this could be the starting point for further discussions in the working group.

7.2.17 The delegation of Japan supported by Singapore expressed the opinion that eyesight standards need not be included within the proposed medical standards as even ICAO had deleted these provisions and that there was a need to rationalize the provisions accordingly.

7.2.18 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee referred the proposals for detailed consideration to WG 1.

#### **Regulation I/10 (Recognition of certificates)**

7.2.19 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/42), referring to the proposal set out in document STW 39/7/14 considered at STW 39, to require Administrations to conduct, prior to recognition of certificates, an evaluation of the application by the Party concerned to ensure that the requirements of regulations I/6, I/8 and I/9 have been met; proposed to extend this evaluation to cover all the provisions of the STCW Convention and Code.

7.2.20 Japan (STW 40/7/52) proposed an amendment to paragraph 5 in regulation I/10 so as to make the intended effect more clear and appropriate.

7.2.21 The Sub-Committee, noting that these proposals did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred them to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

#### **Regulation I/11 (Revalidation of certificates)**

##### ***Revalidation of certificates***

7.2.22 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/11) proposed amendments to section A-I/11 to harmonize and clarify methods to establish continued professional competence with a view to prevent potential different interpretations.

7.2.23 OCIMF (STW 40/7/36) proposed amendments to section A-I/11 with a view to improve/maintain the level of professional competence.

7.2.24 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/47) proposed amendments to sections A-I/11 and B-I/11 of the STCW Code, in order to make the revalidation processes clear with a view to maintaining professional competence.

7.2.25 The Republic of Korea (STW 40/7/59) proposed to amend regulation I/11 of the STCW Convention to clarify different interpretations among different countries relating to tanker training courses.

7.2.26 The delegation of Japan, supported by others, did not agree with the proposal by OCIMF relating to formally reassess competence of all certified seafarers at intervals not exceeding five years as the present requirements for ensuring competence through required sea service was adequate. In this context, the delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the view that this was covered under regulation I/14 and the ISM Code.

7.2.27 The delegation of China, supported by others, expressed the opinion that there was no need for revalidation of chapter VI requirements as there were built-in provisions within chapter VI and that there was a need to be flexible in the approach towards maintaining professional competence.

7.2.28 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, agreed that there was a need to harmonize the seagoing service requirements for revalidation and supported the intent of the proposed amendments in document STW 40/7/47 relating to service at a lower rank.

7.2.29 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concern that the proposal by Austria *et al.* would lead to downscaling the current requirements.

7.2.30 The delegation of France described the various means of revalidation and the possible different interpretations and expressed the view that there was a need to harmonize and simplify the requirements as proposed by Austria *et al.*

7.2.31 The delegation of Singapore, supported by others, agreed in principle with the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran. However, they expressed concerns related to increasing the sea service for supernumerary capacity from three months to 12 months.

7.2.32 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, was of the view that revalidation requirements were applicable to certificates issued under chapter V.

7.2.33 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that:

- .1 the proposal contained in document STW 40/7/47 and some elements in documents STW 40/7/11 and STW 40/7/59 should be considered in detail by the working group and accordingly referred them for detailed consideration to WG 1; and
- .2 there was no support for the proposal contained in document STW 40/7/36 relating to formal reassessment of professional competence which should therefore not be further discussed by the working group. However, the group could consider providing guidance relating to the approval of internal company training and assessment procedures concerning maintenance of the level of professional competence.

### ***Maintaining professional competence***

7.2.34 In light of MSC 84 instructions to consider measures to ensure compliance with the requirements in the STCW Convention, to maintain professional competence in areas where training cannot be conducted on board ship, the United States (STW 40/7/29) proposed amendments to regulation VI/1 and section A-VI/1 with a view to provide refresher training for those areas of basic safety training or instruction, where training cannot be conducted on board ship.

7.2.35 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/63) proposed amendments to regulation I/11, regulation VI/1 and sections A-I/11, A-VI/1, A-VI/2 and A-VI/3 to ensure that professional competence, in areas of chapter VI of the STCW Code where training cannot be conducted on board, is maintained.

7.2.36 The delegation of China, while supporting the proposal by the United States, expressed the view that as there were a number different factors involved, it was necessary to provide a flexible approach towards refresher training. This view was supported by a number of delegations.

7.2.37 The delegation of Japan, supported by the BIMCO observer, expressed the view that there was no need to make refresher training mandatory, as there were indeed some ships where this training could be conducted on board.

7.2.38 A number of delegations expressed the opinion that there was merit in both proposals and that they should be discussed in detail by the working group.

7.2.39 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee referred the proposals for consideration in detail, initially by WG 1 and thereafter by WG 2.

### **Regulation I/12 (Use of simulators)**

7.2.40 IALA (STW 40/7/58) proposed amendments to section B-I/12 of the STCW Code to ensure realistic simulation of VTS communication between ship and shore.

7.2.41 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Regulation I/14bis (Effective communications)**

7.2.42 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/42), taking into account the discussions at ISWG 1, proposed a revised text for new regulation I/14bis to address issues relating to effective communications.

7.2.43 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

## **7.3 CHAPTER II – MASTER AND DECK DEPARTMENT**

### **Celestial Navigation**

7.3.1 The United States (STW 40/7/20) proposed amendments to tables A-II/1, A-II/2 and B-II/1 in chapter II of the STCW Code to address, in their opinion, the outdated requirement of celestial navigation.

7.3.2 Norway (STW 40/7/23) proposed to delete certain mandatory elements in part A of the STCW Code related to celestial navigation, and transferring them as recommendations into part B of the Code.

7.3.3 China (STW 40/7/48) proposed amendments to tables A-II/1 and A-II/2 of chapter II of the STCW Code relating to celestial navigation.

7.3.4 The delegation of the Bahamas, supported by others, expressed the view that there was a need to retain certain provisions relating to celestial navigation and therefore agreed with the proposals by the United States and China to ensure that deck officers had the basic underpinning knowledge. Furthermore, in their opinion it was premature to delete these requirements as the GPS system did not have an alternative back-up in case of a failure.

7.3.5 The delegation of Denmark, supported by others, agreed with the proposal by Norway to delete the mandatory provisions and transfer them to part B of the STCW Code as guidance. The majority of the delegations did not support the proposal by Norway.

7.3.6 The delegation of the Netherlands, while supporting the proposal by Norway, expressed the view that in the near future e-navigation would become available and that the present reviewed requirements would be applicable for at least the next decade which should therefore be taken into account when finalizing the requirements related to celestial navigation.

7.3.7 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that documents STW 40/7/20 and STW 40/7/48 should be considered in detail by WG 1 and that document STW 40/7/23 should not be further considered by the working group.

### **Visual signalling**

7.3.8 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/46) proposed amendments to table A-II/1 of the STCW Code to provide limited competence for distress visual signalling and the requirements in the International Code of Signals using Morse Code.

7.3.9 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

7.3.10 In this context the Sub-Committee recalled that, in considering the report of the *ad hoc* intersessional working group, it had invited NAV 55 to review SOLAS regulation V/19.2.2.2 relating to carriage of daylight signalling lamp and annex 4 of COLREGs and appendix 1 of the International Code of Signals that prescribed SOS to be sent by a signalling lamp with a view to deleting training requirements relating to visual signalling by Morse Code. The Sub-Committee recognized that, subject to the outcome of the working group discussions, it might be necessary to amend the request to NAV 55.

### **ARPA and radar requirements**

7.3.11 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/43) proposed amendments to tables A-II/1 and A-II/2 of the STCW Code to remove inconsistencies associated with ARPA and radar requirements.

7.3.12 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Marine environment awareness training**

7.3.13 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/44) proposed amendments to table A-II/1 of the STCW Code to provide training in marine environment awareness.

7.3.14 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Able seafarer (Deck)**

7.3.15 Japan (STW 40/7/53) proposed amendments to the draft text related to training and certification of ratings as “able seafarer deck” with a view to making it clear that the application of this regulation should be at each Authority’s discretion.

7.3.16 The delegation of Sweden, supported by others, did not agree with the proposal. In this context, the delegation of Australia expressed the opinion that the STCW Convention was related to standards and not to manning requirements and that only if and when an Able Seafarer deck was placed on board then they should be trained to the applicable standards.

7.3.17 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed the opinion that the proposal could lead to some confusion, as similar requirements were not included in other provisions of chapter II.

7.3.18 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed that this proposal should not be further considered by WG 1.

### **VTS training**

7.3.19 IALA (STW 40/7/58) proposed amendments to tables A-II/1, A-II/2 and A-II/3 of the STCW Code to train ship masters, chief officers and officers in charge of navigation watches to make the best possible use of VTS.

7.3.20 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

## **7.4 CHAPTER III – ENGINE DEPARTMENT**

### **Near-coastal voyage requirements**

7.4.1 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/12) proposed amendments to section A-III of the STCW Code with a view to harmonize the provisions for near-coastal voyages of sections A-III/1, A-III/2 and A-III/3.

7.4.2 The delegation of Denmark, supported by others, did not agree with the proposal. However, in their view there was a need to clarify the term “limited propulsion power” in paragraph 8 of section A-III/2 and harmonize it with the requirements in paragraph 9 of section A-III/1.

7.4.3 The delegation of the United States supported the later proposal.

7.4.4 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed that the working group should only clarify the term “limited propulsion power” in paragraph 8 of section A-III/2 and harmonize it with the requirements in paragraph 9 of section A-III/1.

### **Methods of demonstrating competence**

7.4.5 India (STW 40/7/14) proposed “Approved ship’s engine-room operational machinery and equipment laboratory ashore” as one of the means of imparting methods for demonstrating competence of various functions at the operational level and provided details of equipments and machineries required for that purpose.

7.4.6 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Emerging and contemporary technologies**

7.4.7 Japan (STW 40/7/18) proposed amendments to tables A-III/1 and A-III/2 of the STCW Code with a view to reorganizing the existing functions and to include a new function “Engineering watch” in order to meet the requirements of contemporary and emerging technologies.

7.4.8 The delegation of France, supported by others, expressed the view that there was no need to change the existing requirements.

7.4.9 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the opinion that while they could support the proposal, in principle, it should be discussed further in the working group.

7.4.10 The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by others, expressed the opinion that there was a need to exercise caution, as the proposed review would entail a very heavy workload. Furthermore, in case a new function was added, it would be necessary to reissue all engineers' certificates which would place a very heavy burden on Administrations.

7.4.11 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that some elements of the proposal could be included in the existing tables of competence but that it was not necessary to reorganize the tables as proposed. In this context, the Sub-Committee advised the delegation of Japan to identify only those elements which could be included in tables A-III/1 and III/2 and propose the same in the working group.

#### **Deletion/reduction/amendment in the period of education and training for engineers**

7.4.12 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/13) proposed amendments to regulations III/1, III/2 and III/3 of the STCW Convention with a view to harmonize education and training requirements in regulation III/1 with similar requirements in other parts of the Convention which were based on meeting standards of competence, rather than serving a specific length of time. Furthermore, they also proposed to upgrade seagoing service requirements in regulation III/2 to ensure that a person, before being assigned duties as 2/E or C/E on increasingly sophisticated ships, had adequate experience to be able to perform his/her duties in a safe and efficient manner.

7.4.13 India (STW 40/7/16), commenting on paragraphs 4.15 to 4.21 of document STW 40/7/3, opposed the proposal by some countries for deleting and/or modifying the approved education and training of at least 30 months' engineering knowledge plus six months of watchkeeping under supervision, as presently required under regulation III/1, paragraph 2.3, unless a mechanism was put in place to ensure equity either at the entry level between graduates and non-graduates or increasing the sea service at the operational and management levels. In this context, they also emphasized the key elements for marine engineers such as competency, alternate career options, upgrading of skills to match the advancement of technology and managing risks by higher operational efficiency.

7.4.14 China (STW 40/7/49) expressed the view that the mandatory minimum requirement of "at least 30 months which includes onboard training documented in an approved training record book" in paragraph 2.3 of regulation III/1 was essential for ensuring the competency of engineer officers to perform their duties in a sophisticated engine-room on board modern ships and, therefore, could not be simply removed from this regulation. However, for those who had successfully completed college education or higher, as required, they suggested that a certain extent of flexibility could be allowed on the required minimum training duration. Accordingly, they proposed amendments to paragraph 2.3 of regulation III/1.

7.4.15 The delegation of Australia, supported by others, expressed the opinion that there was a need to retain approved education and training of at least 30 months, as required under regulation III/1, paragraph 2.3.

7.4.16 The delegation of Sweden, supported by others, expressed the opinion that as the STCW Convention was competence-based there was no need to retain approved education and training of at least 30 months just for the sake of keeping a specified time period. Accordingly, they supported retaining the preliminary text developed at the *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group as set out in document STW 40/7/6.

7.4.17 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, agreed with the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran. In this context, the delegation of Norway, supported by others, did not agree with the proposal.

7.4.18 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed to delete the requirement of approved education and training of at least 30 months, as required in paragraph 2.3 of regulation III/1. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee referred document STW 40/7/13 for detailed consideration to WG 1.

### **Upgrading seagoing service requirements**

7.4.19 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/13) proposed to upgrade seagoing service requirements in regulation III/2, noting that adequate experience in a position of responsibility was essential for a person to be able to perform assigned duties as 2/E or C/E on increasingly sophisticated ships in a safe and efficient manner.

7.4.20 Having briefly discussed the proposal, the Sub-Committee referred it for detailed consideration to WG 1.

### **Electro-technical officers**

7.4.21 Germany (STW 40/7/17), commenting on the proposals regarding minimum requirements for certification of the electro-technical officer (proposed regulation III/6) and of the senior electro-technical officer (proposed regulation III/7) in document STW 40/7/6, recalled that they were in favour of one level of training. However, as a compromise, they could accept two levels of training, provided one of them was at support level. Accordingly, they proposed training and certification requirements for the electro-technical officer and the able seafarer electro-engineering.

7.4.22 Japan (STW 40/7/54) expressed the opinion that it was not necessary to introduce mandatory training and certification requirements for the electrical officer and the electro-technical officer into the STCW Convention and Code, as long as the existing requirements and qualifications were appropriately implemented. In this context, Japan had proposed amendments to tables A-III/1 and A-III/2 (STW 40/7/18) to upgrade the requirement for engineers to meet emerging technology.

7.4.23 Denmark (STW 40/7/56) opposed the proposal to introduce new requirements and qualifications for the electric officer and the electronic-technical officer. Instead, Denmark proposed to use an alternative model to regulate the skills and competences for electro-technical officers via certification in accordance with chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code and based on tables A-III/1 and A-III/2 of the STCW Code. In their opinion, this approach would be more consistent with the principles of the 1995 revision of the STCW Convention and would ensure that all seafarers responsible for electrical, electronic and control engineering were duly qualified in accordance with the same set of competence requirements.

7.4.24 The delegation of France, supported by others, expressed the opinion that the proposal by Japan and Denmark would be a step backwards and that this issue that had been fully considered and agreed upon at the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group and that the Canadian Safety Transportation Board, while investigating a casualty on board a passenger ship, had identified the need for electro-technical officers. Furthermore, they also indicated that there was a considerable demand for such officers on board ships and in the light of the remarks of the Secretary-General, there was a need to make the profession attractive by providing a progressive career path. They also supported the proposal by Germany to provide training requirements for “able seafarer electro-engineering”.

7.4.25 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, expressed the view that there was a need to include training requirements for electro-technical officers and that it should be restricted to one grade at officer level and that they could also support the proposal by Germany. It was important to ensure that a new department would not be created on board.

7.4.26 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the view that there was no need to provide separate training requirements for electro-technical officers as it was not a full-time position on board all ships. In this context, they supported the proposal by Denmark.

7.4.27 The delegation of Greece expressed the opinion that the text proposed by the *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW Working Group was still premature and should be reconsidered by a correspondence group.

7.4.28 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that provisions for electro-technical competence were required; the training requirements developed by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group should be carried forward and the proposal by Germany for training requirements for “able seafarer electro-engineering” should be considered by WG 2.

### **Training and certification requirements for personnel serving on steam-powered ships**

7.4.29 In light of the increase in the number of LNG Carriers with steam propulsion systems, India (STW 40/7/28 and STW 40/7/37) proposed mandatory minimum training and certification requirements for engineer officers serving on steam-powered ships and maintaining a watch on board such a ship.

7.4.30 The delegation of Japan, supported by others, expressed the opinion that similar training provisions already exist in chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code, hence there was no need to provide for them separately and in case such new requirements were needed a separate module could be included in chapter V.

7.4.31 The delegation of Australia, supported by others, endorsed the proposal in principle and expressed the view that there was a need to clarify sea service requirements for specific types of ships.

7.4.32 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, supported by others, expressed the view that there was some merit to elaborate the existing provisions by using some of the information presented in the proposal.

7.4.33 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed that, whilst there was no support for the proposal, WG 2 should clarify the sea service requirements and examine the existing tables with a view to strengthening with some of the elements proposed. In this context, the

Sub-Committee advised the delegation of India to identify only those elements which could be included in the existing requirements and propose the same in the working group.

### **Marine environment awareness training**

7.4.34 Consequential to their proposal to amend table A-II/1 (STW 40/7/44), Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/45) proposed amendments to amend table A-III/1 of the STCW Code to provide training in marine environment awareness.

7.4.35 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

### **Able Seafarer (Engine)**

7.4.36 Consequential to the proposed amendments relating to “able seafarer deck”, Japan (STW 40/7/53) proposed similar amendments to the draft text related to training and certification of ratings as “able seafarer engine”.

7.4.37 To this end, the Sub-Committee agreed that the discussions and decisions relating to “able seafarer deck” were also applicable for “able seafarer engine” and should not be considered further by WG 1.

## **7.5 CHAPTER IV – RADIOCOMMUNICATION AND RADIO PERSONNEL**

7.5.1 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/30) proposed a review of regulation IV/2 of the STCW Convention in order to redress the inconsistency in using “GMDSS radio personnel” and “GMDSS radio operator” terms.

7.5.2 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 1 for consideration in detail.

## **7.6 CHAPTER V – SPECIAL TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONS ON CERTAIN TYPES OF SHIPS**

### **Tanker training**

7.6.1 The United States (STW 40/7/19) proposed consequential amendments to section B-V/1 of the STCW Code, guidance regarding the training and qualifications of tanker personnel, as a result of the proposed amendments to regulation V/1-1 (mandatory minimum requirements for the training and qualifications of masters, officers and ratings on oil, and chemical tankers) and V/1-2 (mandatory minimum requirements for the training and qualifications of masters, officers and ratings on liquefied gas tankers). Furthermore, they proposed amendments to section B-V/1 to provide guidance on the shore-based fire-fighting course in the proposed amendments to regulations V/1-1 and V/1-2.

7.6.2 Norway (STW 40/7/21) proposed new and amended tables in section A-V/1 on minimum standard of competence for seafarers’ assigned duties or responsibilities related to cargo or cargo equipment on oil, chemical, or liquefied gas tankers.

7.6.3 OCIMF and INTERTANKO (STW 40/7/32 and STW 40/7/33) proposed:

- .1 that the text “and with immediate responsibility for” in regulation V/1-1, paragraphs 3 and 5, and regulation V/1-2, paragraph 3, should be replaced with the text “with responsibility for the management of” with a view to remove ambiguity; and
- .2 to add a new competence in table A-V/1-1-1 to ensure that mitigative actions were implemented following an incident to protect the health and safety of the seafarers and the marine environment.

7.6.4 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/40) proposed amendments to chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code relating to the fire-fighting ability of seafarers serving on board oil, chemical and liquefied gas tankers.

7.6.5 The Republic of Korea (STW 40/7/61) suggested amending proposed regulations V/1-1 and V/1-2 of the STCW Convention regarding special training requirements for personnel on tankers to clarify the ambiguous interpretation.

7.6.6 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, agreed with the proposal set out in document STW 40/7/19 as well as to including tank cleaning and gas freeing in the proposed table A-V/1-1-1, as proposed in document STW 40/7/33.

7.6.7 The delegation of Norway, supported by others, agreed with the proposal set out in document STW 40/7/40.

7.6.8 The delegation of Japan, supported by others, agreed with the proposal set out in document STW 40/7/21. In this context, the delegation of Norway advised the Sub-Committee that they would be presenting a comparison table between the table developed at the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group and those proposed by them to the working group to facilitate the debate.

7.6.9 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the view that the proposed clarification in document STW 40/7/32 should be provided as guidance in part B of the STCW Code.

7.6.10 The delegations of Japan and Singapore expressed the view that the proposal set out in document STW 40/7/61 should be given due consideration as it included some of the practices being presently followed. A number of delegations did not concur with this view.

7.6.11 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee referred documents STW 40/7/19 and STW 40/7/21 for detailed consideration to WG 2. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee also referred to WG 2:

- .1 document STW 40/7/32 for consideration with a view to provide the proposed clarification as guidance in part B of the STCW Code;
- .2 document STW 40/7/33 for inclusion of additional KUPs in table A-V/1-1-1 relating to tank cleaning and gas freeing; and

- .3 document STW 40/7/61 to consider provisions related to tanker endorsement and alternative sea service requirements.

### **Dynamic Positioning systems**

7.6.12 India (STW 40/7/15) proposed competence requirements for personnel operating Dynamic Positioning (DP) systems and maintaining a DP watch on board a ship which should lead to an appropriate endorsement.

7.6.13 IMCA (STW 40/7/64), commenting on document STW 40/7/15, expressed the opinion that the proposal needed to be revised or expanded in a number of areas and that IMCA would be prepared to work with other interested organizations to develop workable and achievable competence standards to be incorporated into the STCW Convention for shipboard DP personnel.

7.6.14 OCIMF (STW 40/7/67), commenting on document STW 40/7/15, expressed the opinion that the proposal needed to be revised and expanded in a number of areas to include all relevant ship types and the various levels of DP competence as well as address all disciplines required for the safe operation of these systems.

7.6.15 The delegation of Singapore, supported by others, expressed the view that, taking into account the existing industry standards, any training requirement should be included as guidance in part B of the STCW Code and that this should be limited to safety issues only.

7.6.16 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee advised India, IMCA and OCIMF to jointly develop guidance related to personnel operating DP systems, taking into account the comments made in plenary, and submit it to STW 41 for further consideration.

### **Training requirements for personnel on ships operating in ice-covered waters**

7.6.17 Norway (STW 40/7/24 and STW 40/7/25) proposed a new regulation V/[4] for inclusion in the STCW Convention and a new section A-V/[4] in the STCW Code with a view to introduce mandatory minimum requirements for the training and qualification of navigators serving on board ships operating in areas where ice or ice floes are likely to be present.

7.6.18 The delegation of the Russian Federation expressed support for the proposal and advised the Sub-Committee that they too had prepared a similar proposal which, due to technical reasons, could not be submitted to this session and would be doing so to the next session.

7.6.19 The delegation of New Zealand, supported by others, while agreeing to the proposal in principle, expressed the view that there was a need to consider all aspects very carefully, including taking into account the present discussions in the DE Sub-Committee related to the amendments to Guidelines for ships operating in Arctic ice-covered waters, which was expected to be approved by MSC 86. In this context, the delegation of the United States informed the Sub-Committee that, as stated in document DE 52/9/2, they would be submitting a new work programme proposal to MSC 86 with a view to making the revised guidelines applicable for both Polar regions as mandatory requirements and this might have a bearing on this issue. A number of delegations expressed the view that appropriate requirements could be included as guidance in part B of the STCW Code.

7.6.20 The delegation of Chile expressed the view that, taking into account the recent accidents in the Antarctic, Argentina and Chile submitted a proposal to MSC 86 with a view to ensuring that officers are adequately trained for navigating in the Antarctic Ocean and therefore supported the proposal.

7.6.21 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed to establish a correspondence group coordinated by Norway\* with the following terms of reference:

Taking into account the comments and decisions made at STW 40, existing provisions in the STCW Convention and Code, the outcome of DE 52 relating to the amendments to the Guidelines for ships operating in Arctic ice-covered waters, and documents STW 40/7/24 and STW 40/7/25 (Norway), the correspondence group should:

- .1 develop a preliminary proposed text for training guidance for personnel operating in ice-covered water; and
- .2 submit its report to STW 41.

In this context, the Sub-Committee agreed that the correspondence group should not consider at this stage issues relating to applicability and concentrate on the technical guidance on training.

### **Passenger ships**

7.6.22 CLIA (STW 40/7/65) provided comments on document STW 40/7/7 relating to the use of the term “large” passenger ships in part B of the STCW Code. Accordingly, CLIA proposed to delete this term as the same had already been done in relation to the safety discussions at the Committee. Furthermore, CLIA proposed amendments to section B-V/2 to clearly outline the training required or to the extent to which the crew should be trained.

7.6.23 In this context, the Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 79 (MSC 79/23, paragraph 4.12) had agreed that the word “large” should be deleted from the title of agenda item on “Large Passenger Ship Safety” and that the working group and subsidiary bodies should continue to develop relevant parameters, as necessary, for application purposes of any proposed requirements and recommendations, bearing in mind that a “one size fits all approach” should be avoided since each area of safety (i.e. fire, machinery, stability, lifesaving, search and rescue, etc.) had different concerns.

7.6.24 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 2 for consideration in detail.

---

\*

**Coordinator:**

Ms Turid Stemre  
Senior Adviser  
Legislation and International Relations  
Norwegian Maritime Directorate  
Tel.: +47 52 74 51 51  
Mobile: +47 95 06 96 12  
E-mail: tbs@sjofartsdir.no

### **Guidance regarding training of personnel in charge of – or involved in – anchor-handling operations**

7.6.25 Norway (STW 40/7/27) proposed additional guidance related to personnel serving on board offshore supply vessels involved in anchor-handling operations.

7.6.26 After a brief discussion, the majority of the Sub-Committee supported the proposal and referred it for detailed consideration to WG 2.

### **Training requirements for personnel serving on board offshore supply vessels**

7.6.27 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, expressed concerns that while developing the training requirements for personnel serving on board offshore supply vessels the fundamental purpose of considering the special character and circumstances of the offshore industry had not been taken into account by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group. This might result in a future shortage of manpower for manning the ever-growing fleet of offshore supply vessels. Accordingly, they proposed that the Sub-Committee should instruct the working group to reconsider the proposed text relating to training and certification requirements for personnel serving on board OSVs with a view to including them in chapters II and III after providing exemptions as appropriate.

7.6.28 The delegation of Norway, supported by others, did not concur with the view expressed by the United States and others, as such exemptions would downscale the existing standards.

7.6.29 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed to retain the text as prepared by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group.

## **7.7 CHAPTER VI – EMERGENCY OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, SECURITY, MEDICAL CARE AND SURVIVAL FUNCTIONS**

### **Maintaining professional competence**

7.7.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that this issue had already been considered under regulation I/11.

### **Security training**

7.7.2 ISF (40/7/39) expressed the opinion that the draft requirements for security-related training should be made consistent with the existing structure of safety and pollution prevention training and therefore proposed that the new section A-VI/6 should be included in existing section A-VI/1 with corresponding amendments to section B-VI/1.

7.7.3 In this context, the Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 83 had:

- .1 endorsed the proposed amendments to regulation VI/1 and sections A-VI/1 and B-VI/1 addressing the basic security-related training and security-related familiarization training for seafarers without designated security-related duties and for all shipboard personnel, respectively;

- .2 endorsed a new regulation VI/6 and new sections A-VI/6 and B-VI/6, addressing the standards of competency and security-related familiarization training for seafarers with designated security-related duties, which were set out in annexes 2 to 4 to document STW 38/17, on the understanding that these would be reviewed by the STW Sub-Committee in conjunction with the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code before being presented to the Committee with a view to approval and circulation for adoption; and
- .3 approved MSC.1/Circ.1235 on Guidelines on security-related training and familiarization training for shipboard personnel as an interim measure based on the proposed above-mentioned amendments to the STCW Convention and Code with a view to ensure that seafarers trained during the intervening period are not adversely affected.

7.7.4 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, supported by others, agreed with the proposal. In this context, the delegation of the United States stressed that these proposed requirements were based on the requirements of the ISPS Code to ensure training be provided similar to that for basic safety, and that the Committee had already issued the proposed amendments as MSC.1/Circ.1235 to facilitate the training of seafarers in the interim period prior to formal adoption. It was therefore important to ensure that the substance of these proposed amendments was not changed.

7.7.5 The Sub-Committee recalled that STW 38 agreed and MSC 83 concurred when it endorsed the draft amendments to the STCW Convention and STCW Code prepared by STW 38 that:

- .1 bearing in mind the terminology used in section A-VI and, in particular, the use of the term “designated”, to use the expression “with designated security duties” in order to reflect the approach of the ISPS Code in relation to “shipboard personnel having specific security duties” and to use the expression “without designated security duties” to reflect the approach in relation to “all other shipboard personnel”;
- .2 following the broad pattern and philosophy of chapter VI that there should be a three-tiered approach to the training and familiarization requirements for shipboard personnel. This should consist, in broad terms, of the basic training or instruction for security awareness, additional training specific for those with designated security duties, and the onboard familiarization training on each ship as outlined in the table below:

<i>for all seafarers without designated security duties</i>	<i>for seafarers with designated security duties</i>	<i>for ship security officers</i>
Basic training or instruction		
	Training for personnel with designated security duties	
		Training for a certificate of proficiency*
Shipboard Familiarization training	Shipboard Familiarization training	The familiarization with specific duties, at the current stage, is addressed only through regulation I/14.1.4

- .3 in line with the instructions of MSC 81, all persons without designated security duties employed or engaged on board should undergo security-related familiarization training when they join the ship and that such familiarization training needs to be ship-specific and based on the requirements of the ship's security plan.

7.7.6 Following the clarification by the Secretariat, the delegation of Sweden suggested that the proposal could be discussed in the working group only to ensure that there were no inconsistencies with the safety and environmental protection training requirements without changing the substance of the proposed amendments.

### **Fire-fighting training for personnel on tankers**

7.7.7 Austria *et al.* (STW 40/7/41) proposed amendments to chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code to include competence table and training requirements related to fire fighting on tankers.

7.7.8 The observer from OCIMF requested a clarification as to whether the proposed training was in addition to the existing two levels, i.e. basic fire-fighting training and advanced fire fighting. In this context, the delegation of Germany confirmed that this would indeed be in addition to the requirements related to basic fire-fighting training and advanced fire fighting for those ratings with immediate responsibility for loading, discharging, care in transit, handling of cargo, tank cleaning or other cargo-related operations.

7.7.9 Having briefly discussed the proposal, the Sub-Committee referred the proposal for detailed consideration in conjunction with document STW 40/7/19 to WG 2.

### **Anti-pollution manager**

7.7.10 The Republic of Korea (STW 40/7/60) provided information on marine antipollution manager training conducted by them. In their opinion, onboard training for the personnel operating or monitoring the equipment or facilities went a long way towards protection of the

---

\* As specified in regulation VI/5 and sections A-VI/5 and B-VI/5.

marine environment. Accordingly, the Republic of Korea proposed amendments to section B-VI of the STCW Code to introduce this concept as guidance.

7.7.11 After some discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed that this proposal should not be further considered by the working group.

## **7.8 CHAPTER VII – ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION**

7.8.1 The Sub-Committee noted that STW 39 had prepared the preliminary draft revised text of chapter VII and that no further proposals had been submitted to this session. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee instructed WG 1 to finalize the text for chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code.

## **7.9 CHAPTER VIII – WATCHKEEPING**

7.9.1 OCIMF and INTERTANKO (STW 40/7/34) proposed to amend section A-VIII/2, paragraph 51 of the STCW Code, with a view to ensure that for safety and environmental reasons, a continuous anchor watch should be maintained at anchor unless an equivalent level of safety was achievable through alternative arrangements.

7.9.2 The Islamic Republic of Iran (STW 40/7/62), commenting on document STW 40/7/4, proposed amendments to section B-VIII/2 of the STCW Code with a view to provide guidance on keeping a safe anchor watch.

7.9.3 In this context, the Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 78 had approved STCW.7/Circ.14 on Guidance for masters on keeping a safe anchor watch.

7.9.4 The delegation of Greece, supported by others, agreed that the proposal, as set out in document STW 40/7/62, would be the way forward. In this context, the observers from INTERTANKO and OCIMF stated that they could accept the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee referred only document STW 40/7/62 for detailed consideration to WG 2.

### **Prevention of Drug and Alcohol abuse**

7.9.5 OCIMF (STW 40/7/35) proposed to amend the title of proposed paragraph 12 of section A-VIII/1 as “Drug and Alcohol abuse prevention” and add a new paragraph 12*bis* in the same section to ensure seafarers found to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol “shall” not be permitted to perform safety and security and marine environment-related duties.

7.9.6 Following the discussions and decision of the *ad hoc* intersessional STW working group relating to the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code, Germany (STW 40/7/38) proposed a revised text for inclusion in regulation VIII/1 and sections A-VIII/1 and B-VIII/1 related to prevention of drug and alcohol abuse.

7.9.7 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 2 for consideration in detail.

### **Bridge and engine-room resource management**

7.9.8 Australia *et al.* (STW 40/7/55) proposed to move bridge and engine-room resource management principles from section B-VIII/2 to section A-VIII/1 of the STCW Code.

7.9.9 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 2 for consideration in detail.

### **Number of deck officers involved in watchkeeping**

7.9.10 ITF and IFSMA (STW 40/7/57), commenting on the outcome of the *ad hoc* intersessional STW working group relating to watchkeeping requirements, expressed the view that:

- .1 whilst some variation in the hours of work was acceptable to suit specific circumstances or type of operation of the vessel, it was unacceptable that the hours of work were over 14 hours or that the hours of rest over a seven-day period were reduced to below 77 hours, as set out in ILO Convention No.180;
- .2 the basis of the variation in the minimum hours of rest, arbitrarily agreed by Administrations, were based on unspecified social conditions allowed for in other conventions. However, as the STCW Convention was related to safety issues, it would be inappropriate to introduce such social or contractual issues within the STCW Convention; and
- .3 the resolution adopted during the adoption of ILO Convention No.180 in 1995, made clear that nothing in that convention should interfere with the requirements of the STCW Convention.

Accordingly, they proposed amendments to regulation VIII/1 and sections A-VIII/1 and B-VIII/2.

7.9.11 The delegation of Denmark, supported by others, did not concur with the proposal and suggested that, instead, the text developed by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group should be finalized at this session.

7.9.12 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, supported by others, expressed the view that social and contractual issues should not be included in the STCW Convention.

7.9.13 The delegation of Sweden, supported by others, expressed the view that fatigue was an issue of great concern and would need to be addressed.

7.9.14 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the view that there was a need to ensure fitness for duty and that hours of rest were properly implemented.

7.9.15 The delegation of the Bahamas, supported by others, expressed the view that the proposed requirements should not conflict with the requirement of MLC 2006 and proposed that the issue relating to the carriage of three deck officers should be considered under agenda item 8.

7.9.16 The delegation of Australia, as the Chairman of Working Group 3 on Safe Manning recalled that the issue of carriage of three deck officers had been fully discussed and decided upon at STW 39 and it would serve no purpose to discuss this any further.

7.9.17 The delegation of Greece emphasized that the key to eliminating fatigue was in enforcing the requirements related to hours of work and rest and that the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group had confirmed that the scope of the STCW Convention addressed and

covered only training and watchkeeping standard was related to standards and was not supposed to govern manning requirements.

7.9.18 The ITF observer clarified that, whilst they were opposed to the two-watch system, their proposed amendments did not prohibit it and agreed with the text developed by the *ad hoc* intersessional STW Working Group. However, they were opposed to the inclusion of the clause that allowed for exemption from the hours of rest as set out in the STCW Convention.

7.9.19 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that:

- .1 the scope of the STCW Convention covered only standards of training and watchkeeping and not any manning requirements;
- .2 the issues in the proposal were mostly outside the scope of the review, as approved by the Maritime Safety Committee and would therefore need explicit endorsement of MSC 86 before it could be considered further;
- .3 as the STCW Convention was a safety-related Convention, there should be no reference to social or contractual issues;
- .4 according to IMO requirements, there should be no direct reference to provisions of ILO Conventions. In case cross reference was necessary, actual text would need to be inserted;
- .5 the revised text should be restricted to hours of rest and that also only from a safety perspective; and
- .6 there was no need to further discuss this under agenda item 8, as the matter had been discussed in detail and decided upon, proposed by STW 39 and should not be forwarded to WG 2.

## **VTS training**

7.9.20 Consequential to the proposed amendments to tables A-II/1, A-II/2 and AII/3, IALA (STW 40/7/58) proposed amendments to section A-VIII/2, part 3-1.

7.9.21 The Sub-Committee, noting that this proposal did not require any principle decision of the Sub-Committee, referred it to WG 2 for consideration in detail.

## **7.10 OTHER ISSUES**

### **Enhancement of seafarers' awareness of counter-piracy measures**

7.10.1 In introducing document STW 40/7/68 (Secretary-General), the Director, Maritime Safety Division, advised the Sub-Committee that this had been submitted in view of the current alarming rate of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships, in particular in waters off the coast of Somalia and in the Gulf of Aden. He outlined the efforts made by all the IMO bodies concerned (the Maritime Safety Committee, Council and Assembly) and the Secretary-General, who, among others, had briefed the United Nations Security Council contributing to the latter adopting resolutions 1816, 1846 and 1851. In addition, IMO had convened a series of consultative events, culminating in a high-level meeting held in Djibouti from 26 to 29 January 2009, to conclude and adopt a regional instrument to assist countries in the region to build capacity to

suppress piracy and armed robbery against ships in the Western Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden. He expressed the view that the shipping industry should continuously use effective management practices in compliance with the IMO guidelines and recommendations adopted by the Committee; security systems established through the ISPS Code; and training of crew appropriately in order to ensure that they were ready to deal with any eventuality. Finally, he urged the Sub-Committee to consider including appropriate provisions in the STCW Convention and Code for the training of seafarers on matters relating to the prevention and suppression of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships during its ongoing comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code.

7.10.2 There was overwhelming support and appreciation by all who spoke for the efforts of the Secretary-General over many years, and in particular more recently of not only raising awareness of the unprecedented increase of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships, in particular in waters off the coast of Somalia and in the Gulf of Aden, but also putting the public spotlight on the plight of innocent seafarers, fishermen and passengers who have been unwittingly caught up, in large numbers, in the terrifying ordeal of hijackings and hostage-taking for ransom, as well as taking appropriate steps to combat this modern-day scourge.

7.10.3 The delegation of Norway, supported by many others, expressed the view that, whilst there was an urgent need to include in an appropriate part of the STCW Convention and Code provisions for the training of seafarers on matters relating to the prevention and suppression of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships, the matter required careful consideration in view of the complex issues involved and it would therefore be appropriate to invite Member Governments and international organizations to submit proposals for consideration at STW 41.

7.10.4 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, expressed the opinion that it would be desirable if WG 2 gave preliminary consideration, pending further submissions.

7.10.5 The delegation of the Bahamas, supported by others, expressed the opinion that there was a need to give careful consideration to the type of training required in accordance with the degree of responsibility.

7.10.6 The delegation of the Philippines, supported by others, whilst agreeing to the inclusion of such training requirements in the STCW Convention, expressed the opinion that further careful consideration was needed on the basis of further submissions, taking into account the current revision of the relevant guidelines developed by the Committee. Furthermore, he stressed that any proposed training should not support the arming of seafarers.

7.10.7 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that there was an urgent need to include appropriate provisions in the STCW Convention to ensure that seafarers are properly educated and trained to face situations whereby their ship is under attack by pirates. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit proposals for consideration at STW 41.

### **Measures to improve training on board/accommodation for training berths on new ships**

7.10.8 The Sub-Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 83 had considered a proposal by India (MSC 83/12/4) for a long-term view to address the global shipping manpower shortage by the inclusion of a requirement for trainees and the provision of training berths on board ships in the relevant IMO conventions. After an in-depth discussion, MSC 83 had agreed to

forward document MSC 83/12/4 to the Sub-Committee to consider how to address measures to improve training on board and to advise the Committee accordingly; and

- .2 STW 39 had considered the issue and had agreed that, in order to provide proper advice to the Committee, it was necessary to discuss this issue in greater detail. Accordingly, STW 39 had invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit comments and proposals on the best way forward to this session.

7.10.9 India (STW 40/13/1) advised the Sub-Committee that they had submitted a proposal for a new work programme item to amend the 1969 Tonnage Convention to exempt accommodation of training berths from tonnage calculations in the work programme of the SLF Sub-Committee for consideration by MSC 85.

7.10.10 In this context, the Sub-Committee noted that, following consideration of document MSC 85/23/6 (India), proposing to develop requirements to ensure that new ships undertaking international voyages have adequate facilities for the carriage of trainees, including certified accommodation for them, which should also meet the requirements of the ILO Convention on Accommodation of Crew, MSC 85 had agreed to forward the proposal to the Sub-Committee for its consideration in the context of its work on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code and to advise the Committee accordingly.

7.10.11 The delegation of China, supported by others, appreciated the efforts by India in light of the severe shortage of officers, to raise the profile of the need for the availability of berths for trainees.

7.10.12 The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by others, expressed the opinion that, whilst they agreed in principle with the content of the proposal, it would be difficult to develop and implement any mandatory provisions to provide training berths on board ships. Furthermore, this was primarily the responsibility of the shipowner and while a number of shipowners were providing berths for cadets on board their ships, others were having well known difficulties in doing so.

7.10.13 The delegation of Norway, supported by others, expressed the views that tonnage of a ship was not only used to determine the port and lighthouse dues but also for other purposes relating to the safety of life at sea and protection of the marine environment. Hence the proposal by India might not be the way forward.

7.10.14 The observer from ISF emphasized that the shipowners were taking their responsibility seriously to provide adequate training berths where possible. Furthermore, MLC 2006 had provisions to promote the provision of more training berths particularly on new buildings.

7.10.15 The observer from INTERTANKO appreciated the efforts by India and the information provided by ISF. They stressed that there was a great need to provide adequate training berths on board ships and the industry was addressing this matter seriously and progressively.

7.10.16 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee, noting that the SLF Sub-Committee would be considering the proposal by India relating to exemption accommodation spaces for trainees from tonnage calculations for new buildings, agreed that it might not be possible to include such provisions within the requirements of the STCW Convention. However, one way forward could be to adopt a resolution, at the Diplomatic Conference to be convened, to adopt the

amendments emanating from the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code, urging Member Governments to encourage shipowners to ensure that adequate certified accommodation for trainees/cadets was available on board ships, in particular, new-buildings. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee advised India to prepare a draft resolution in close co-operation with interested Member Governments and international organizations for consideration at STW 41 with a view to submit it to the Conference for adoption and agreed to advise the Committee accordingly after STW 41.

## **7.11 REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUPS**

### ***Report of the working group to consider the comprehensive review of chapters I, II, III and VII***

7.11.1 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 40/WP.2 and addendum), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

## **CHAPTER II – MASTER AND DECK DEPARTMENT**

### **Regulation II/4**

#### **Mandatory minimum requirements for certification of ratings forming part of a navigational watch**

7.11.2 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed that regulation II/4, paragraph 4, should be deleted as this referred to transition arrangements prior to the entry into force of the 1995 amendments to the STCW Convention and that the same applied to regulation III/4.

#### **Table A-II/1 Navigation at the operational level**

##### *Plan and conduct a passage and determine position*

7.11.3 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to include the Note in column 1 as in column 2 referring to ECDIS regarding “Training and assessment in the use of ECDIS .....” as in the new draft text on ECDIS in column 1, page 4.

#### **VTS training**

7.11.4 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed amendments to A-II/1, A-II/2 and A-II/3 related to training of deck officers to ensure best possible use of VTS.

#### **Visual signalling**

7.11.5 In considering the proposed amendments related to requirements for training in visual signalling, the Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to leave it in square brackets, along with text already in square brackets in STW 40/7/5, pending the outcome of the consideration of the matter by NAV 55.

#### **Celestial navigation**

7.11.6 In considering the proposed amendments to address the requirement of celestial navigation, the Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to retain the existing text in

tables A-II/1 and A-II/2 and made amendments to section B-II/1 accordingly with a view to simplifying the requirement and the capability of utilizing modern technology.

### **Marine environment awareness training**

7.11.7 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to amendments to table A-II/1 to provide marine environment awareness training under the existing competence “ensure compliance with pollution-prevention requirements”.

### **Table A-II/2 Navigation at the management level**

*Determine position and the accuracy of resultant position fix by any means*

7.11.8 In considering column 3 – Methods for demonstrating competence, the Sub-Committee noted that several delegations were of the view that “Decca” and “Loran” could be deleted, as these were now outdated systems and others, while agreeing with the deletion of “Decca”, supported retaining “Loran” as this was potentially being re-utilized. Subsequently, the Sub-Committee agreed to delete both “Decca” and “Loran” but use a more generic term instead. As the Sub-Committee was unable to agree on the exact text and, bearing in mind the continuing development of e-navigation, it agreed to invite the Committee to instruct NAV 55 to advise on the correct terminology, taking into account the user needs and current work on e-navigation.

### **ARPA and radar training**

7.11.9 With regard to table A-II/1 and, in particular, the issue of ARPA and ECDIS training not being required for those who serve exclusively on ships fitted with such equipment and which limitation should be reflected in endorsement to the seafarer concerned, the delegation of the Netherlands had voiced concerns within the group on the requirement for endorsement for the seafarer. Because of the considerable implications of this, the Sub-Committee noted that the group did not consider the matter further.

### **Preliminary revised draft text of chapter II of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.10 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter II of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 1 of document STW 40/WP.3/Add.1, with a view to approval, in principle, by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

## **CHAPTER III – ENGINE DEPARTMENT**

### **Methods for demonstrating competence**

7.11.11 In considering the proposed amendments to table A-III/1 in respect of an additional method of demonstrating competence of various functions at the operational level, the Sub-Committee noted that the group was of the view that the existing text in column 3 covered the proposal contained in document STW 40/7/14 adequately. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed not to proceed further with the proposal.

### **Training requirements for engineers on steam-powered ships**

7.11.12 Some delegations within the group were of the view that there was not enough emphasis on having seagoing service on steam-powered ships before sailing on such ships. Others were of the view that it was already covered in the existing regulations and that

exceptions should not be made for steam-powered ships as opposed to other types of propulsion machinery. The Sub-Committee noted that the group was unable to reach agreement on this issue. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee also noted that the group, due to time constraints, was unable to discuss the changes to existing tables of competency to strengthen the existing knowledge, understanding and proficiencies.

### **Deletion/reduction/amendment in the period of education and training for engineers**

#### Regulation III/1

7.11.13 In considering the amendments proposed in document STW 40/7/13, the Sub-Committee noted that the group had noted that the requirement for watchkeeping became extremely difficult as most ships were being operated with periodically unmanned machinery space. Consequently, the Sub-Committee also noted that the group had prepared amendments to regulation III/1.

7.11.14 The delegation of India, supported by others, expressed concern that under the justification of harmonization with other parts of the Convention, the competence standards relating to engineer officers were being compromised. Even though engineers from other disciplines, i.e. civil, mechanical, aeronautical, etc., required 36 to 48 months to qualify, the current education and training requirements for marine engineers was now being reduced from 30 to 12 months. This, in their opinion, would lead to a lowering of standards and was in conflict with the agreed terms of reference for the comprehensive review.

7.11.15 In this context, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, supported by others, expressed the opinion that the STCW Convention was a competence-based instrument and, except this regulation, no other regulation specified a fixed time period of training. Furthermore, they were also of the view that emphasis should be placed on achieving the desired level of competence rather than on a time period of training and supported the text developed by the group.

### **Upgrading seagoing service requirements**

7.11.16 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed with the proposal in document STW 40/7/13, as modified, and prepared draft amendments accordingly.

#### Regulation III/3

7.11.17 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed in principle with the proposal in document STW 40/7/13 to delete the last sentence of paragraph 3. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee also noted that the group had, noting the concern expressed over the lack of endorsement causing problems with port State control, retained the words “provided the certificate is so endorsed”.

### **Near-coastal voyage requirements**

#### **Sections A-III/1, A-III/2 and A-III/3**

7.11.18 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to harmonize the propulsion power limitations in sections A-III/1, A-III/2, and A-III/3 but could not agree on the figure. Accordingly, the group retained all figures proposed, i.e. 6,000 kW and 8,000 kW along with the

existing figures in square brackets in the new draft text for regulations A-III/1 and A-III/2 for further consideration at STW 41.

### **Marine environment awareness training**

7.11.19 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to amendments to table A-III/1 to provide marine environment awareness training under the existing competence “ensure compliance with pollution-prevention requirements”.

### **Preliminary revised text of chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.20 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 2 of document STW 40/WP.2/Add.2, with a view to approval by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

### **CHAPTER VII – ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION**

7.11.21 In considering the preliminary revised draft text as prepared by the intersessional working group (STW 40/7/9), the Sub-Committee noted that the group had developed further draft amendments to paragraphs 3 and 4 which involved a reduction in sea service required when associated with an approved training programme. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee also noted that the group had, noting concerns expressed by several delegations on the potential reduction of sea service and that it might be in contradiction to the associated regulation, agreed to put square brackets around the relevant sea service requirements in new draft paragraph 4.2.

### **Preliminary revised draft text of chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.22 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 3 of document STW 40/WP.2/Add.2, with a view to approval, in principle, by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

### ***Oral report***

7.11.23 Having received an oral report relating to the review of chapter I, and certain sections of chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code from the Chairman of WG 1, the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs 7.11.24 to 7.11.30.

### **CHAPTER I – GENERAL PROVISIONS**

7.11.24 The Sub-Committee noted that, due to paucity of time, the group had only considered partially the proposals related to regulation I/9 and did not consider any other proposals related to chapter I. To this end, the group had recommended that all proposals under this chapter should be considered at an intersessional meeting.

### **Preliminary revised text of chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.25 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in document STW 40/7/4 and as amended by the group relating to regulation I/9, with a view to approval, in principle, by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

7.11.26 The Sub-Committee noted the concerns raised within the group relating to IMHA's proposal for assessment of minimum entry level and in-service physical abilities for seafarers and, in particular, concerns related to assessment of minimum entry level and in-service physical abilities for seafarers which could lead to the establishment of new medical standards, particularly for "sudden incapacitation", and hence further review was necessary. Furthermore, a number of delegations in the group had supported the development of a different set of standards for entry level and in-service seafarers, since officers have different tasks.

7.11.27 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had recommended that there was a need to develop corresponding Guidelines by ILO, IMO, WHO, assisted by IMHA.

### **CHAPTER III – ENGINE DEPARTMENT**

#### **Tables A-III/1 and A-III/2**

7.11.28 The Sub-Committee noted that, due to time constraints, the group was not able to fully consider elements of the proposal set out in document STW 40/7/18 for inclusion in tables A-III/1 and A-III/2 and had recommended that these should be further considered at an intersessional meeting. To this end, the delegation of Japan had informed the group that they would identify the elements that could be included to the proposed intersessional meeting.

7.11.29 The Sub-Committee also noted that, in considering the proposals set out in documents STW 40/7/28 and STW 40/7/37, the group had agreed to include some additional steam-related knowledge, understanding and proficiencies into table A-III/2.

#### **Electro-technical officers**

7.11.30 The Sub-Committee noted that the group was unable to consider proposals relating to the training and certification requirements for electro-technical officers due to the large number of diverging views on matters of principle and had recommended that it should be further considered at an intersessional meeting.

#### ***Report of the working group to consider the comprehensive review of chapters IV, V, VI and VIII***

7.11.31 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 40/WP.3 and addendum), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

### **CHAPTER IV – RADIOCOMMUNICATION AND RADIO PERSONNEL**

#### **Preliminary revised text of chapter IV of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.32 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter IV of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 1 of document STW 40/WP.3/Add.1, with a view to approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

## **CHAPTER VI – EMERGENCY, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, MEDICAL CARE AND SURVIVAL FUNCTIONS**

### ***Security training***

7.11.33 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed to the preliminary draft revised text of competence requirements developed by STW 38 and endorsed by MSC 83, as finalized by the group.

### ***Fire-fighting training for personnel on tankers***

7.11.34 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had prepared draft amendments relating to fire-fighting training for personnel serving on board tankers. However, the proposed table of competence for the Tanker Fire-Fighting course did not contain sufficient competences and KUPs to justify a stand-alone course and hence the group had agreed to keep this table in square brackets for further detailed consideration at the next session. In this context, the group had also agreed that if the proposed table of competences could not be considered suitable for a stand-alone course at the next session, then these competences could be considered for inclusion in the table of competence for the fire prevention and fire-fighting course and, consequently, the proposed requirements for the tanker fire-fighting training in chapter VI, as well as regulations V/1-1 and V/1-2, could be deleted.

### **Preliminary revised text of chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.35 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 3 of document STW 40/WP.3/Add.2, with a view to approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

## **CHAPTER VIII – WATCHKEEPING**

### ***Fitness for duty***

7.11.36 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had noted that there was no consensus relating to the exemption clause in the proposed paragraph 9 of section A-VIII/1 and agreed to leave the text in square brackets for further consideration at the next session. Consequently, the Sub-Committee agreed to the other amendments relating to fitness for duty.

### ***Anchor watch***

7.11.37 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had agreed that guidance on keeping a safe anchor watch should be included in section B-VIII/2.

### ***Prevention of Drug and Alcohol abuse***

7.11.38 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had finalized the text of regulation VIII/1 and sections A-VIII/1 and B-VIII/1 relating to prevention of drug and alcohol abuse.

### ***Bridge and Engine-room resource management***

7.11.39 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had, noting that there were similarities between Bridge Resource Management and Engine-room Resource Management principles and

that there was merit in combining the principles of resource management, agreed to transfer the provisions from part B to part A, as proposed, with some amendments.

### ***VTS training***

7.11.40 The Sub-Committee noted that the group did not agree to include mandatory requirements for the exchange of information on navigation reporting and VTS procedures between the Master and the Pilot in section A-VIII/2.

### **Preliminary revised text of chapter VIII of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.41 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter VIII of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 4 of document STW 40/WP.3/Add.2, with a view to approval in principle by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

### ***Oral report***

7.11.42 Having received an oral report relating to the review of chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code from the Chairman of WG 2, the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs 7.11.43 to 7.11.48.

## **CHAPTER V - SPECIAL TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONNEL ON CERTAIN TYPES OF SHIPS**

### **Training and certification of personnel on board offshore supply vessels**

7.11.43 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had noted that, since there was no definition for offshore supply vessel and offshore support vessel, as well as the types of operation they were involved in, it was premature to set out mandatory requirements for training and certification of personnel serving on board these vessels and had agreed that guidance for training and certification for personnel serving on board offshore supply/support vessels (OSV) should be included in part B of the STCW Code.

7.11.44 However, the Sub-Committee noted that, due to paucity of time, the group was unable to consider in detail the text developed for inclusion in part B of the STCW Code and the proposal by Norway, as set out in document STW 40/7/27, relating to anchor handling. Accordingly, the group had agreed to keep the text in square brackets and recommended that they be further considered at an intersessional meeting.

### **Tanker training**

7.11.45 The Sub-Committee noted that that the group had prepared preliminary revised draft text of the regulations V/1-1 and V/1-2 and the respective sections of part A of the STCW Code. However, due to a lack of time, the group was only able to revise table A-V/1-1-1 on the specification of minimum standard of competence relating to basic training for oil and chemical tanker operations. With regards to the proposed amendments to tables competence A-V/1-1-2, A-V/1-1-3, A-V/1-2-1 and A-V/1-2-2 on the specification of minimum standard of competence in advanced training for oil tanker cargo operations, advanced training for chemical tanker cargo operations, basic training for liquefied gas tanker cargo operations and advanced training for liquefied gas tanker cargo operations respectively, the group had agreed to retain them in square brackets and recommended that they be further considered at an intersessional meeting.

7.11.46 The Sub-Committee further noted that the group was not able to consider the proposals in documents STW 40/7/19, STW 40/7/32, STW 40/7/33, STW 40/7/61 and STW 40/7/65 and had only partially considered proposals in documents STW 40/7/21 and STW 40/7/40. To this end, the group recommended that they be considered at an intersessional meeting.

7.11.47 The observer from IPTA, supported by ICS, INTERTANKO and OCIMF, expressed concerns at the inclusion of regulation V/1-1.6.2.2 which, in their opinion, could lead to personnel who had never previously served on a tanker, being able to undergo basic oil and chemical tanker training which need not be carried out on board, thereafter to undergo an advanced chemical tanker training which again need not be on board, before spending one month on board a chemical tanker, carrying out cargo operations which might not involve any chemicals, and thus obtaining a certificate permitting them to take charge of multigrade cargo operations on a ship carrying a variety of dangerous chemicals

### **Preliminary revised text of chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code**

7.11.48 The Sub-Committee endorsed the preliminary revised draft text of chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annex 2 of document STW 40/WP.3/Add.3, with a view to approval, in principle, by MSC 86 and finalization at STW 41.

### **Intersessional meeting**

7.11.49 The Sub-Committee recalled the recommendation of the working groups to convene an *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW working group to:

- .1 consider documents STW 40/7/4, STW 40/7/10, STW 40/7/11, STW 40/7/22, STW 40/7/26, STW 40/7/30, STW 40/7/31, STW 40/7/36, STW 40/7/42, STW 40/7/47, STW 40/7/50, STW 40/7/51, STW 40/7/58, STW 40/7/59, and STW 40/7/66, and prepare the revised text of chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code;
- .2 consider documents STW 40/7/29 and STW 40/7/63 and finalize requirements relating to continue professional competence in areas where training cannot be conducted on board;
- .3 consider the advice from NAV 55 and finalize requirements relating to visual signalling;
- .4 consider the advice from NAV 55 relating to replacing terms “Decca” and “Loran” with a more generic term;
- .5 finalize tables A-III/1 and A-III/2;
- .6 consider changes to the propulsion power limitations for the near coastal provisions in chapter III;
- .7 finalize training and certification requirements for electro-technical officers;
- .8 guidance for training of personnel serving on board offshore supply/support vessels (OSV), including anchor-handling operations;
- .9 finalize tables A-V/1-1-2, A-V/1-1-3, A-V/1-2-1 and A-V/1-2-2;

- .10 consider the proposals in documents STW 40/7/19, STW 40/7/21, STW 40/7/32, STW 40/7/33, STW 40/7/40, STW 40/7/61 and STW 40/7/65 and finalize the text of chapter V;
- .11 finalize sea service requirements in section A-VII/4 relating to alternative certification of able seafarer deck and able seafarer engine;
- .12 consider proposed paragraphs 6 and 9 of section A-VIII/1 and finalize the text;
- .13 consider the proposed table of competence in document STW 40/7/41 relating to tanker fire-fighting course as stand-alone course or inclusion of the tanker-related competence in the “fire prevention and fire fighting” table of competence;
- .14 consider guidance related to training of personnel operating:
  - .1 dynamic positioning systems; and
  - .2 in ice-covered waters,

and report to STW 41 with a view to finalization of the draft amendments.

7.11.50 The delegation of Panama, supported by others, expressed the view that while they could agree to the convening of an intersessional meeting at this instance as a special case, they would prefer that the same was convened back to back with STW 41. This would be of great assistance to a number of countries and, in particular, to delegates from developing countries and those from countries who have to travel a long way to London.

7.11.51 The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by others, expressed the view that there was a need to have some time between the intersessional meeting and STW 41. This would allow the Secretariat to prepare consolidated documents reflecting the then current status of the revised STCW Convention and Code; and delegations to have consultations with various experts within their Administrations before considering and agreeing the final text at STW 41. Furthermore, as the proposed dates for STW 41 were 11 to 15 January 2010, the holding of an intersessional meeting in the previous week, i.e. 4 to 8 January 2010, would, in the light of the holiday season, be extremely difficult for delegations to prepare for, and participate in, effectively.

7.11.52 The Secretary-General clarified that, while in accordance with the guidelines on the organization and methods of work of the Organization, the intersessional meeting should be convened back to back with STW 41, the Sub-Committee should base its decision not on convenience to delegates but on how to ensure the success of the Diplomatic Conference by submitting the best possible, fully developed and high quality basic document for consideration and subsequent adoption. Furthermore, it would be logistically extremely difficult for the Secretariat to prepare for two major meetings immediately after the Christmas holiday season.

7.11.53 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that there was indeed a compelling need to convene an intersessional meeting to enable STW 41 to finalize the draft revised text of the STCW Convention and Code with a view to adoption by the Conference of STCW Parties in June 2010. The Sub-Committee further agreed that the Chairman and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairmen of the working groups, would prepare the terms of reference for the intersessional meeting of the STW working group and that the Committee, following endorsement of the intersessional meeting, should decide on its timing.

## 7.12 CONCLUSIONS

7.12.1 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee to:

- .1 approve the convening of an *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW working group to progress work further in accordance with the terms of reference as set out in annex 4;
- .2 decide on the timing of the above intersessional meeting;
- .3 approve, in principle, the preliminary draft revised text of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annexes 1 to 3, prepared by the Sub-Committee with a view to finalization at STW 41;
- .4 authorize STW 41 to finalize the draft text of amendments to the STCW Convention and Code with a view to their circulation by the Secretary-General for consideration by the Diplomatic Conference;
- .5 request the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Director-General of ILO, to take appropriate action to convene the said Conference in the Philippines in June 2010, pending decisions by the Council and Assembly on the budget for the biennium 2010-2011; and
- .6 request the Secretary-General to circulate the text of the proposed amendments, finalized by STW 41, to the Conference with a view to adoption.

## 8 REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPLES FOR ESTABLISHING THE SAFE MANNING LEVELS OF SHIPS

8.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 81, based on a proposal from the United Kingdom *et al.*, had decided to include in the Sub-Committee's work programme and the provisional agenda for STW 38, a high-priority item "Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships", with a target completion date of 2008, in co-operation with the NAV Sub-Committee, as necessary, and that MSC 84 had subsequently extended the target completion date to 2010.

8.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that:

- .1 STW 38 had established a working group to determine the basic criteria to be observed in reviewing the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships and subsequently an intersessional correspondence group to report to STW 39; and
- .2 STW 39 had established a working group to define and clarify the intent and terms of objectives for determining minimum safe manning levels of ships, embodied in resolution A.890(21), as amended, including the need to develop a framework that considers the effectiveness and efficiency relating to the performance of tasks, based on scientific knowledge and expertise in areas such as human system's integration, ship construction, training, vessel operations, and fatigue research; and prepare a preliminary draft revised text of resolution A.890(21) on Principles of safe manning, as amended.

8.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 39 had re-established the intersessional Correspondence Group (CG) under the coordination of the United States to progress matters further with the following terms of reference:

Noting document STW 39/8/1 (ITF and IFSMA) and taking into account documents STW 39/WP.2 (Report of the Working Group), STW 39/8 (Report of the Correspondence Group to STW 39), MSC/Circ.878–MEPC/Circ.346 on Human Element Analysing Process (HEAP), the outcome of the decisions of MSC 84 relating to the provisions for determining safe manning and the outcome of the ILO meetings on port State control and flag State implementation in relation to the Maritime Labour Convention (MLC) 2006, the CG:

- .1 should develop a draft framework for determining minimum safe manning that should consider the effectiveness and efficiency relating to the performance of tasks, based on scientific knowledge and expertise in areas such as man/machine interface, ship construction, training, vessel operations and fatigue research and take into account the needs identified in annex 5 of annex 1 of STW 39/WP.2; and
- .2 should commence its work after MSC 84 and provide a comprehensive report for submission to STW 40.

8.4 The United States (STW 40/8) advised that the correspondence group (CG) had noted that, in the context of the work to be undertaken, MSC 84 had agreed to include in the work programme of the STW Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for STW 40, a high-priority item on “Mandatory requirements for determining safe manning” with a view to making the formal process for the determination of safe manning levels of vessels mandatory, in order to standardize the processes for the determination of safe manning levels and that ILO had developed flag and port State guidelines for the implementation of the Maritime Labour Convention (MLC) 2006 to assist Administrations, in particular, to implement requirements related to work/rest hours and minimum safe manning of ships. The majority of the participants supported a less structured process that could be integrated into a company’s ISM Code Safety Management System (SMS) adding a manning focus without replicating the structure of the ISM Code itself as a stand-alone manning evaluation document. As time was short, the CG focused on what should be considered to constitute a framework and its purpose. Accordingly, four questions were circulated to the CG and the responses were summarized in annex 1. The CG concurred that manning was an integral part of the ship’s SMS under the ISM Code. Hence, it was essential for a company to periodically evaluate the efficiency of the SMS relating to manning. In the opinion of the CG, this could only be achieved by the setting of goals and the means to measure its achievement, i.e. setting a framework for full and effective enforcement. Such a framework should integrate the overall elements of A.890(21) directly and should be able to demonstrate that its elements were incorporated into the manning and human resource evaluation process used by the company and the Administration.

8.5 The United States (STW 40/8/1) provided a holistic analysis of the many factors that influenced safe manning and proposed that they should be taken into account when developing a framework for safe manning levels on ships.

8.6 Denmark *et al.* (STW 40/8/2) expressed the opinion that, when establishing the safe manning level, many factors needed to be considered and that no simple solution was available. Accordingly, review of the present resolution required a holistic approach in order to address the overall ship safety and that the principles should be goal-based. Furthermore, in their opinion following the provisions of section 6 of the ISM Code could be a way forward.

8.7 ISF (STW 40/8/3), commenting on the report of the correspondence group, expressed the opinion that:

- .1 annex 2 of the report was not discussed within the correspondence group. Accordingly, the report should be amended to indicate that the group was not able to discuss the merits and content;
- .2 the report went too far in relation to determining minimum safe manning of a ship and more importantly did not take into account the views expressed within the group;
- .3 it was imperative for the shipowner to maintain flexibility in determining the manning of a ship with due regard to the commercial operation, hence they could not support any provisions in the present resolution, A.890(21), as amended, that went beyond the scope of minimum safe manning;
- .4 no mention was made of the provisions in the ILO Maritime Labour Convention relating to manning levels;
- .5 the exact text from the STCW Convention should be used; and
- .6 development of flag and port State control guidelines, relating to manning levels and the maximum hours of work and minimum hours of rest in the Maritime Labour Convention, would have a major impact on ensuring that correct records were kept with a view to ensuring that the appropriate regulations were being complied with.

8.8 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, supported by others, agreed, in principle, with the work carried out by the correspondence group and expressed the view that there were a number of factors such as type of ship, trading pattern, equipment on board, etc., that needed to be taken into account when determining safe manning of ships.

8.9 The delegation of the Netherlands, commenting on the report of the correspondence group, expressed the opinion that there was a common understanding that the ships should be sufficiently and efficiently manned. The only difference was in the approach to achieve this objective. While mandatory provisions were prescribed in SOLAS regulation V/14 and STCW regulation I/14, the companies should implement these provisions through the ISM Code. In this context, the delegation of the Bahamas agreed that it was the shipowner's responsibility to ensure that their ships were properly manned and that there was a need for further guidance to shipowners and to further develop resolution A.890(21) for the benefit of Administrations.

8.10 The delegation of Greece, supported by others, expressed the opinion that some Administrations were not taking the existing provisions of resolution A.890(21), as amended, into account when determining safe manning of ships. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee could draft another resolution to encourage Administrations to apply the existing provisions when determining safe manning of the ships flying their flag.

8.11 The observer from ITF indicated that their submission to STW 39 had not been given due consideration by the CG and expressed the opinion that it should have been appended to the report.

8.12 The delegation of Portugal, supported by others, expressed their support for developing a framework for determining minimum safe manning.

8.13 The delegation of Malta, supported by others, expressed the view that the problems related to manning existed specially for small ships on short sea voyages and agreed that there was a need to develop a framework which might become mandatory at a later stage.

8.14 The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by others, expressed the view that while the manning of ships was the responsibility of companies, Administrations could not abrogate their responsibility and should prescribe rules for determining minimum safe manning.

8.15 The observer from ILO expressed the view that the principles of safe manning had evolved over the years. Furthermore, MLC 2006 and its guidelines also refer to safe manning of ships, therefore the matters should be discussed through a joint ILO/IMO mechanism.

8.16 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee referred documents STW 40/8 (Report of the Correspondence Group) and STW 40/8/1 (United States), STW 40/8/2 (Denmark *et al.*) and STW 40/8/3 (ISF), to the working group established to consider the review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships, for detailed consideration.

8.17 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by the Netherlands (STW 40/INF.2) on a recently conducted study commissioned by the Dutch Government relating to fatigue and fatigue prevention on board seagoing ships.

#### **Establishment of the working group**

8.18 The Sub-Committee established a working group to consider the review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships with the following terms of reference:

Taking into account the comments and decisions made in plenary, the working group should consider documents STW 40/8 (Report of the correspondence group), STW 40/8/1 (United States), STW 40/8/2 (Denmark *et al.*) and STW 40/8/3 (ISF) to:

- .1 develop a draft manning system framework for inclusion in the draft revised resolution on Principles of safe manning; and
- .2 based on the initial draft developed at STW 39 (STW 39/WP.2, annex 1), prepare a preliminary draft revised text of resolution A.890(21) on Principles of safe manning, as amended,

and submit its report to the plenary on Thursday, 5 February 2009.

#### **Report of the working group**

8.19 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 40/WP.4), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

### **Development of a draft manning system framework**

8.20 The Sub-Committee noted that the Group had agreed that elements of both the Correspondence Group's report (STW 40/8) and the submission of the United States (STW 40/8/1) could be used in developing the structure of a manning framework, *vis-à-vis* its ultimate content.

8.21 The Sub-Committee also noted that there had been an extensive discussion on the proposed draft manning system framework. A majority of the delegations had agreed that the proposed draft framework should be based on the four main steps as outlined below:

- .1 submission from the company;
- .2 evaluation by the Administration;
- .3 maintenance of minimum safe manning; and
- .4 compliance monitoring.

The steps outlined above should enable Administrations and companies to achieve greater depth and insight into the interdependencies and interactions of operational elements that influence the amounts of crew member workload and, ultimately, the proposed minimum safe manning level.

8.22 With respect to step 1 above, the Sub-Committee noted that the Group had agreed that submission of a proposal from the company for minimum safe manning should define the nature of the operation of the ship and also take into account the requirements of Annexes 2 and 3 of the draft revised resolution A.890(21), as amended, in the context of the management of the safety, security and protection of the marine environment. The Group had agreed that this process required the breakdown of the operational elements into functions. Annex 2 of the draft revised resolution A.890(21), as amended, provided guidance on the relevant functions that needed to be considered; however, it had been noted by the Group that this list was not exclusive. Each function could then be broken down into a task list that included the following attributes, namely duration, frequency, competence and importance. Once a function had been broken down into specific tasks and their attributes, it would then be necessary to determine the specific personnel qualifications, operational policy and procedures, and infrastructure/technology necessary to perform each task. The information generated in defining the operational factors should be used to determine how many tasks could be executed by an individual under the possible range of operational conditions.

8.23 With respect to step 2, the Sub-Committee noted that the Group had agreed that an Administration should evaluate/approve the submission of the company against relevant national and international regulatory requirements and guidelines. Having evaluated and approved the proposal the Administration should issue a minimum safe manning document including special requirements and conditions.

8.24 The Sub-Committee, further noting that the Group could not agree on the issue of provision of necessary supporting documentation on board, and accordingly had left the relevant text in square brackets (annex 5, section 2.2), decided to retain the text in square brackets pending further discussion at STW 41.

8.25 With respect to step 3, the Sub-Committee observed that the Group had agreed that a company should advise the Administration of any changes that would affect the minimum safe manning document and, in such circumstances, prepare and submit a new proposal taking into account Annex 3 of the draft revised resolution A.890(21), as amended.

8.26 With respect to step 4, the Sub-Committee noted that the Group had agreed that the Administration should periodically review the minimum safe manning arrangements.

8.27 The Sub-Committee approved the draft framework for determining minimum safe manning, as given in annex 5 of the annex to document STW 40/WP.4, as amended.

### **Preliminary draft revised text of resolution A.890(21), as amended**

8.28 The Sub-Committee noted that, based on the initial draft developed at STW 39 (STW 39/WP.2, annex 1), the Group had undertaken a review of the draft text of the Annexes to resolution A.890(21), as amended, and recalled that at STW 39 it had agreed that in the whole document the word “level” should be deleted and “safe manning” should be referred to as “minimum safe manning”.

8.29 With respect to annex 3, paragraph 2.7 of document STW 39/WP.2 (draft revised Assembly resolution on Principles of safe manning (resolution A.890(21), as amended)), the Sub-Committee noted that the Group, in line with the decision of STW 39 (STW 39/12, paragraph 8.26), had agreed to amend the text of the paragraph as outlined in the report of STW 39. In order to be consistent with the terminology being used in the draft resolution, the Sub-Committee agreed with the Group’s view that the word “minimum” should be inserted before “safe manning document”.

8.30 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee noted that the Group had prepared a preliminary draft revised Assembly resolution on Principles of Safe Manning (resolution A.890(21), as amended), set out in annex 5.

8.31 The Sub-Committee also observed that the Group had noted that the draft revised text of resolution A.890(21), as amended, should also be reviewed by the NAV Sub-Committee from the operational aspect. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee to:

- .1 instruct NAV 55 to review, on a preliminary basis, the preliminary draft revised Assembly resolution on Principles of Safe Manning (resolution A.890(21), as amended); and
- .2 include the work programme item “Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships including mandatory requirements for determining safe manning” on the work programme of the NAV Sub-Committee and on the provisional agenda for NAV 56.

## **9 MEASURES TO ENHANCE MARITIME SECURITY**

9.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 75 (MSC 75/24, paragraph 22.9) had decided to include in the work programme of the Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for STW 34 a high-priority item on “Measures to enhance maritime security”.

9.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that:

- .1 MSC 81 had authorized the Sub-Committee to start developing appropriate amendments to the STCW Convention and the STCW Code so as to include security-related provisions therein. This was on the understanding that the Sub-Committee would have the flexibility to include, in the list of issues which needed to be examined, any other related issues which transpired as a result of discussions at any stage, subject to informing the Committee; and
- .2 STW 38 had agreed that the required review of chapters I and VIII, so as to include therein appropriate security-related provisions, should be considered in the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code.

9.3 The Sub-Committee recalled that matters related to the inclusion of additional security-related provisions in the relevant parts of the STCW Convention and Code had already been dealt with under agenda item 7 (Comprehensive Review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code) (see paragraphs 7.7.2 to 7.7.6 and 7.11.32).

## **10 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR DETERMINING SAFE MANNING**

10.1 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 84 had considered document MSC 84/22/22 (United Kingdom), proposing to review SOLAS regulation V/14 with a view to making the formal process for the determination of safe manning levels of vessels mandatory, in order to standardize that process, and agreed to include, in the work programme of the Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for STW 40, a high-priority item on “Mandatory requirements for determining safe manning”, with a target completion date of 2010, in co-operation with the NAV Sub-Committee, as necessary and when requested by the Sub-Committee.

10.2 The Sub-Committee noted that, at this session, no documents had been submitted for consideration and consequently agreed to defer further consideration of the item to STW 41.

10.3 The delegation of the Bahamas, recalling the discussions under agenda item 8 relating to the proposed mandatory process for the application of the principles of safe manning in the review of resolution A.890(21), as amended, expressed the view that, since both these agenda items had a common denominator, they should be merged into one agenda item for a more holistic approach. The Sub-Committee concurred with this view and agreed to invite the Committee to merge this item with agenda item 8 (Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships) in the Sub-Committee’s work programme (see agenda item 11).

## **11 WORK PROGRAMME AND AGENDA FOR STW 41**

### **Work programme and provisional agenda for STW 41**

11.1 Taking into account the progress made at the current session, the decisions of MSC 85 and the provisions of the agenda management procedure, the Sub-Committee prepared a proposed work programme and agenda for STW 41 (STW 40/WP.1) based on those approved by MSC 85 (STW 40/2/Add.1, annex 2), and set out in annex 6, for consideration and approval by the Committee. While reviewing the work programme, the Sub-Committee agreed to invite the Committee to:

- .1 extend the target completion date for the work programme item H.6 “Training for seafarer safety representative” to 2010 (paragraph 5.13); and
- .2 merge the work programme items H.4 and H.8 to “Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships including mandatory requirements for determining safe manning” (paragraph 10.3).

11.2 The Sub-Committee anticipated that working groups on the following subjects might be established at STW 41:

- .1 review of the STCW Convention and Code chapters I, II, III and VII;
- .2 review of the STCW Convention and Code chapters IV, V, VI and VIII; and
- .3 review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships.

### **Date of the next session**

11.3 The Sub-Committee noted that the forty-first session of the Sub-Committee had been tentatively scheduled to take place from 11 to 15 January 2010 at IMO Headquarters.

### **High-level Action Plan of the Organization and priorities for the 2008-2009 biennium**

11.4 The Sub-Committee noted the information on the status of planned output of the High-level action plan of the Organization and priorities for 2008-2009 biennium relevant to the Sub-Committee as set out in annex 7 and the Committee is invited to consider it and take action as appropriate.

## **12 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2010**

12.1 In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Maritime Safety Committee, the Sub-Committee unanimously re-elected Rear Admiral Peter Brady (Jamaica) as Chairman and Mr. A.H. Kayssi (Lebanon) as Vice-Chairman for the year 2010.

## **13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Measures to improve training on board**

13.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that document STW 40/13/1 had already been dealt with under agenda item 7 (Comprehensive Review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code) (see paragraphs 7.10.8 to 7.10.16).

### **Ensuring the appropriate application of Article VIII**

13.2 Japan (STW 40/13/2) proposed a draft MSC circular to provide clarification and interpretation of “exceptional necessity” in Article VIII(1) in order to ensure appropriate application of Article VIII.

13.3 In this context, the Sub-Committee recalled that in accordance with the Guidelines on the organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.2, paragraph 3.9), subsidiary bodies should not develop amendments to, or interpretations of, any

relevant IMO instrument without authorization from the Committee(s). Furthermore, subsidiary bodies should ensure that their request complies with the provisions of paragraphs 2.11.1 and 2.11.2 of the aforementioned guidelines.

13.4 Accordingly, the Sub-Committee invited Japan to submit a detailed proposal for consideration by the Committee at its eighty-sixth session.

### **University Institute of Maritime Safety and Security (IUSM)**

13.5 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by Argentina (STW 40/13/3) relating to the University Institute of Maritime Safety and Security of the Prefectura Naval Argentina.

13.6 The delegation of Chile expressed the opinion that the University Institute of Maritime Safety and Security would be of great help for the region to promote safety of life at sea, security and protection of the marine environment and conveyed their appreciation to Argentina.

### **Dispensations issued under Article VIII of the STCW Convention**

13.7 The Sub-Committee considered and noted information (STW 40/13) on the submissions made by the Parties in accordance with Article VIII of the STCW Convention on dispensations granted by them in the year 2007.

### **Information on simulators available for use in maritime training**

13.8 The Sub-Committee noted information provided by the Secretariat that, following the approval by MSC 81 of MSC.1/Circ.1209, requesting Member Governments to provide information on simulators available for use in maritime training, the Secretariat had received information from several Member Governments and added it to the GISIS database which could be viewed by the public on a “read-only” basis. Consequently, the Sub-Committee requested those Member Governments who had not provided such information to do so at an early date to enable the Secretariat to update the information in the GISIS database.

### **Information relating to the due date of the second cycle of reports of independent evaluations pursuant to STCW regulation I/8**

13.9 The Sub-Committee noted information provided by the Secretariat that, pursuant to the requirement of section A-I/8 of the STCW Code, STCW Parties are required to ensure that an independent evaluation of the knowledge, understanding, skills and competence acquisition and assessment activities, and of the administration of the certification activities, was conducted at intervals of not more than five years. Furthermore, pursuant to STCW regulation I/8, STCW Parties were required to communicate information, relating to the evaluation, to the Secretary-General within six months of its completion. As of to date, 96 STCW Parties had communicated their reports of independent evaluation to the Secretary-General. In this context, the list annexed to MSC.1/Circ.1164/Rev.5 contained those STCW Parties, confirmed at various sessions of the Committee, which have communicated information pursuant to regulation I/7, demonstrating that they were giving full and complete effect to the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention and indicating:

- .1 the date of the report of independent evaluation communicated to the Secretary-General (if applicable); and

- .2 the outcome of the process of evaluation of the reports of independent evaluation communicated by the STCW Parties, demonstrating that they were continuing to give full and complete effect to the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention.

A number of STCW Parties had already submitted their second report of independent evaluation. The due date for the second cycle of independent evaluation would be five years from the date of the last evaluation.

13.10 Accordingly, the Sub-Committee urged all STCW Parties, confirmed by the Maritime Safety Committee to be giving “full and complete effect” to the relevant requirements of the STCW Convention, to take the necessary steps to complete either the first or the second independent evaluation, as appropriate, on or before the due date and communicate the information to the Secretary-General within six months of completion of the independent evaluation.

### **Any other issues**

#### ***Fair treatment of seafarers***

13.11 The delegation of India referred to the oil spill incident which occurred on 7 December 2007 off the coast of the Republic of Korea as a consequence of the collision between a crane barge under tow and the anchored M.V. **Hebei Spirit**, flying the flag of Hong Kong, China and carrying Indian seafarers. The delegation of India highlighted that, although the master and chief officer were acquitted by the district court, they were not able to leave the Republic of Korea. Subsequently, they were sentenced by the higher court to jail terms as well as financial penalty. Presently, the master and chief officer were on bail and not allowed to leave the Republic of Korea. In this their opinion, such incidents of criminalization of seafarers would have a negative impact on the recruitment of seafarers and would not enhance the “Go to Sea” campaign launched by the Secretary-General. This view was shared by the observer from INTERTANKO.

#### ***Verification of validity of certificates***

13.12 The delegation of the Russian Federation informed the Sub-Committee that certificates of competencies issued by the Russian Federation could be verified round the clock through their recently launched website <http://www.stcw.ru/>.

13.13 The delegation of Chile informed the Sub-Committee that certificates of competencies issued by Chile could be verified through their website [www.directemar.cl](http://www.directemar.cl).

13.14 The Sub-Committee expressed appreciation to the delegations of the Russian Federation and Chile for the information and requested the Secretariat to update the IMO website accordingly.

### **Expressions of appreciation**

13.15 The Sub-Committee expressed appreciation to the following delegates, who had recently relinquished their duties, retired or were transferred to other duties, for their invaluable contribution to its work and wished them every success in their new duties:

- Captain Ronald Quipildor Tito, Alternate Permanent Representative of Bolivia to IMO (on his return home);

- Captain Hugo Ricaurte Caravias, Permanent Representative of Ecuador to IMO (on his return home);
- Mr. Yun Min Jong and Mr. Kwang Nam Ri (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (on return home); and
- Captain José Caetano de Oliveira Filho of Brazil (on return home).

## 14 ACTION REQUESTED OF THE COMMITTEE

14.1 The Maritime Safety Committee, at its eighty-sixth session, is invited to:

- .1 note the Sub-Committee's ongoing discussions regarding training for seafarer safety representative (SSR) and that it agreed to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element, scheduled to be convened at MEPC 59, relating to inclusion of provisions for SSR in the ISM Code with a view to MEPC 59 referring the outcome of that group on this matter and its own decision thereon directly to STW 41 to enable consideration of relevant training requirements for SSR, if required (paragraphs 5.4 to 5.13);
- .2 instruct NAV 55 to:
  - .1 review SOLAS regulation V/19.2.2.2 relating to the carriage of a daylight signalling lamp, annex IV of COLREGs and appendix 1 of the International Code of Signals prescribing the distress signal SOS to be sent by a signalling lamp, with a view to deleting the training requirements relating to visual signalling by Morse Code in the STCW Convention, and provide its advice to STW 41 (paragraph 7.1.4.1); and
  - .2 taking into account the user needs and current work on e-navigation, provide advice on the correct generic term to replace the terms "Decca" and "Loran" (paragraph 7.11.8);
- .3 approve the convening of an *ad hoc* intersessional meeting of the STW working group to progress work on the Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code in accordance with the terms of reference, as set out in annex 4 (paragraph 7.12.1.1);
- .4 decide on the timing of the above intersessional meeting (paragraph 7.12.1.2);
- .5 approve, in principle, the preliminary draft revised text of the STCW Convention and Code, as set out in annexes 1 to 3, prepared by the Sub-Committee with a view to finalization at STW 41 (paragraph 7.12.1.3);
- .6 authorize STW 41 to finalize the draft text of amendments to the STCW Convention and Code with a view to their circulation by the Secretary-General for consideration by the Diplomatic Conference (paragraph 7.12.1.4);

- .7 request the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Director-General of ILO, to take appropriate action to convene the said Conference in the Philippines in June 2010, pending decisions by the Council and Assembly on the budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (paragraph 7.12.1.5);
- .8 request the Secretary-General to circulate the text of the proposed amendments, finalized by STW 41, to the Conference with a view to adoption (paragraph 7.12.1.6);
- .9 instruct NAV 55 to review, on a preliminary basis, the preliminary draft revised Assembly resolution on Principles of Safe Manning (resolution A.890(21), as amended) (paragraph 8.31.1 and annex 5); and
- .10 approve the report in general.

14.2 In reviewing the work programme of the Sub-Committee, the Committee is invited to consider the revised work programme proposed by the Sub-Committee in general and, in particular, to:

- .1 extend the target completion date for the work programme item H.6 “Training for seafarer safety representative” to 2010 (paragraph 5.13); and
- .2 merge the work programme items H.4 and H.8 to “Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning levels of ships including mandatory requirements for determining safe manning” (paragraph 10.3).

14.3 The Committee is also invited to approve the proposed agenda for the Sub-Committee’s fortieth session (paragraph 11.1 and annex 6).

14.4 The Committee is further invited to note the status of planned output of the High Level Action Plan relevant to the Sub-Committee (paragraph 11.4 and annex 7).

14.5 The Marine Environment Protection Committee, at its fifty-ninth session, is invited to:

- .1 note the Sub-Committee’s ongoing discussions regarding training for seafarer safety representative (SSR) and that it agreed to await the outcome of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element, scheduled to be convened at MEPC 59, relating to inclusion of provisions for SSR in the ISM Code with a view to MEPC 59 referring the outcome of that group on this matter and its own decision thereon directly to STW 41 to enable consideration of relevant training requirements for SSR, if required (paragraphs 5.4 to 5.13); and
- .2 approve the report in general.

\*\*\*

(Annexes 1 to 3 will issued as an addendum)



## ANNEX 4

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE INTERSESSIONAL  
MEETING OF THE STW WORKING GROUP****2nd session of the *Ad hoc* intersessional STW working group**

1 The 2nd session of the *ad hoc* intersessional STW working group, taking into account decisions of STW 40, as set out in section 7 of document STW 40/14, should:

- .1 consider documents STW 40/7/4, STW 40/7/10, STW 40/7/11, STW 40/7/22, STW 40/7/26, STW 40/7/30, STW 40/7/31, STW 40/7/36, STW 40/7/42, STW 40/7/47, STW 40/7/50, STW 40/7/51, STW 40/7/58, STW 40/7/59 and STW 40/7/66, and prepare the revised text of chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code;
- .2 consider documents STW 40/7/29 and STW 40/7/63 and finalize requirements relating to maintain professional competence in areas where training cannot be conducted on board;
- .3 consider the advice from NAV 55 and finalize requirements relating to visual signalling;
- .4 consider the advice from NAV 55 relating to replacing terms “Decca” and “Loran” with a more generic term;
- .5 finalize tables A-III/1 and A-III/2;
- .6 consider changes to the propulsion power limitations for the near coastal provisions in chapter III;
- .7 finalize training and certification requirements for electro-technical officers;
- .8 guidance for training of personnel serving on board offshore supply/support vessels (OSV), including anchor-handling operations;
- .9 finalize tables A-V/1-1-2, A-V/1-1-3, A-V/1-2-1 and A-V/1-2-2;
- .10 consider the proposals in documents STW 40/7/19, STW 40/7/21, STW 40/7/32, STW 40/7/33, STW 40/7/40, STW 40/7/61 and STW 40/7/65 and finalize the text of chapter V;
- .11 finalize sea service requirements in section A-VII/4 relating to alternative certification of able seafarer deck and able seafarer engine;
- .12 consider proposed paragraphs 6 and 9 of section A-VIII/1 and finalize the text;

- .13 consider the proposed table of competence in document STW 40/7/41 relating to tanker fire-fighting course as stand-alone course or for inclusion in the tanker-related competence in the “fire prevention and fire fighting” in the appropriate tables of competence;
- .14 consider guidance related to training of personnel operating:
  - .1 dynamic positioning systems; and
  - .2 in ice-covered waters; and
- .15 submit a report to STW 41 with a view to finalization of the draft amendments to the STCW Convention and Code.

\*\*\*

**ANNEX 5****PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON  
PRINCIPLES OF SAFE MANNING  
(RESOLUTION A.890(21), AS AMENDED)****ANNEX 1****GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICATION OF  
PRINCIPLES OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING****1 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 These Guidelines should be used in applying the principles of minimum safe manning set out in section 3 to ensure the safe operation of ships to which article III of the 1978 STCW Convention, as amended, applies, and the security of ships to which chapter XI-2 of the 1974 SOLAS Convention, as amended, applies, and for the protection of the marine environment.

1.2 The Administration may retain or adopt arrangements which differ from the provisions herein recommended and which are especially adapted to technical developments and to special types of ships and trades. However, at all times the Administration should satisfy itself that the detailed manning arrangements ensure a degree of safety at least equivalent to that established by these Guidelines.

**2 OBJECTIVES**

2.1 The objectives of these Guidelines are to ensure that a ship is sufficiently, effectively and efficiently manned to provide safety and security of the ship, safe navigation and operations at sea, safe operations in port, prevention of human injury or loss of life, the avoidance of damage to the marine environment and to property, and to ensure the welfare and health of seafarers through the avoidance of fatigue. These objectives can be achieved through the following:

- .1 adoption of a goal-based approach;
- .2 standard procedures for effective implementation; and
- .3 effective enforcement.

**3 PRINCIPLES OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING**

3.1 The following principles should be observed in determining the minimum safe manning of a ship:

- .1 the capability to:
  - .1.1 maintain safe navigational, port, engineering and radio watches in accordance with regulation VIII/2 of the 1978 STCW Convention, as amended, and also maintain general surveillance of the ship;
  - .1.2 moor and unmoor the ship safely;

- .1.3 manage the safety functions of the ship when employed in a stationary or near-stationary mode at sea;
- .1.4 perform operations, as appropriate, for the prevention of damage to the marine environment;
- .1.5 maintain the safety arrangements and the cleanliness of all accessible spaces to minimize the risk of fire;
- .1.6 provide for medical care on board ship;
- .1.7 ensure safe carriage of cargo during transit;
- .1.8 inspect and maintain, as appropriate, the structural integrity of the ship; and
- .1.9 operate in accordance with the approved Ship's Security Plan; and
- .2 the ability to:
  - .2.1 operate all watertight closing arrangements and maintain them in effective condition, and also deploy a competent damage control party;
  - .2.2 operate all onboard fire-fighting and emergency equipment and life-saving appliances, carry out such maintenance of this equipment as is required to be done at sea, and muster and disembark all persons on board; and
  - .2.3 operate the main propulsion and auxiliary machinery including pollution prevention equipment and maintain them in a safe condition to enable the ship to overcome the foreseeable perils of the voyage.

3.2 The following onboard functions, when applicable, should also be taken into account:

- .1 ongoing training requirements for all personnel, including the operation and use of fire-fighting and emergency equipment, life-saving appliances and watertight closing arrangements;
- .2 specialized training requirements for particular types of ships and in instances where crew members are engaged in shipboard tasks that cross departmental boundaries;
- .3 provision of proper food and drinking water;
- .4 need to undertake emergency duties and responsibilities; and
- .5 need to provide training opportunities for entrant seafarers to allow them to gain the training and experience needed.

\* \* \*

## ANNEX 2

### **GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINATION OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING**

#### **1 DETERMINATION OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING**

1.1 The minimum safe manning of a ship should be established taking into account all relevant factors, including the following:

- .1 size and type of ship;
- .2 number, size and type of main propulsion units and auxiliaries;
- .3 level of ship automation;
- .4 construction and equipment of the ship;
- .5 method of maintenance used;
- .6 cargo to be carried;
- .7 frequency of port calls, length and nature of voyages to be undertaken;
- .8 trading area(s), waters and operations in which the ship is involved;
- .9 extent to which training activities are conducted on board;
- .10 degree of shore-side support provided to the ship by the company;
- .11 applicable work hour limits and/or rest requirements; and
- .12 the provisions of the approved Ship's Security Plan.

1.2 The determination of the minimum safe manning of a ship should be based on performance of the functions at the appropriate level(s) of responsibility, as specified in the STCW Code, which include the following:

- .1 navigation, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 plan and conduct safe navigation;
  - .2 maintain a safe navigational watch in accordance with the requirements of the STCW Code;
  - .3 manoeuvre and handle the ship in all conditions; and
  - .4 moor and unmoor the ship safely;

- .2 cargo handling and stowage, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 plan, monitor and ensure safe loading, stowage, securing, care during the voyage and unloading of cargo to be carried on the ship;
- .3 operation of the ship and care for persons on board, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 maintain the safety and security of all persons on board and keep life-saving, fire-fighting and other safety systems in operational condition;
  - .2 operate and maintain all watertight closing arrangements;
  - .3 perform operations, as appropriate, to muster and disembark all persons on board;
  - .4 perform operations, as appropriate, to ensure protection of the marine environment;
  - .5 provide for medical care on board the ship; and
  - .6 undertake administrative tasks required for the safe operation and the security of the ship;
- .4 marine engineering, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 operate and monitor the ship's main propulsion and auxiliary machinery and evaluate the performance of such machinery;
  - .2 maintain a safe engineering watch in accordance with the requirements of the STCW Code;
  - .3 manage and perform fuel and ballast operations; and
  - .4 maintain safety of the ship's engine equipment, systems and services;
- .5 electrical, electronic and control engineering, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 operate the ship's electrical and electronic equipment; and
  - .2 maintain the safety of the ship's electrical and electronic systems;
- .6 radiocommunications, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 transmit and receive information using the radio equipment of the ship;
  - .2 maintain a safe radio watch in accordance with the requirements of the ITU Radio Regulations and the 1974 SOLAS Convention, as amended; and
  - .3 provide radio services in emergencies;

- .7 maintenance and repair, comprising the tasks, duties and responsibilities required to:
  - .1 carry out maintenance and repair work to the ship and its machinery, equipment and systems, as appropriate to the method of maintenance and repair used.

1.3 In addition to the factors and functions in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2, the determination of the minimum safe manning should also take into account:

- .1 the management of the safety, security and protection of the environment functions of a ship at sea when not under way;
- .2 except in ships of limited size, the provision of qualified deck officers to ensure that it is not necessary for the master to keep regular watches by adopting a three-watch system;
- .3 except in ships of limited propulsion power or operating under provisions for unattended machinery spaces, the provision of qualified engineer officers to ensure that it is not necessary for the chief engineer to keep regular watches by adopting a three-watch system;
- .4 the maintenance of applicable occupational health and hygiene standards on board; and
- .5 the provision of proper food and drinking water for all persons on board, as required.

1.4 In determining the minimum safe manning of a ship, consideration should also be given to:

- .1 the number of qualified and other personnel required to meet peak workload situations and conditions, with due regard to the number of hours of shipboard duties and rest periods assigned to seafarers; and
- .2 the capability of the master and the ship's complement to coordinate the activities necessary for the safe operation and for the security of the ship and for the protection of the marine environment.

\* \* \*

## ANNEX 3

### **RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING**

#### **1 Responsibilities of companies**

1.1 The Administration may require the company responsible for the operation of the ship to prepare and submit its proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship in accordance with a form specified by the Administration.

1.2 In preparing a proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship, the company should apply the principles, recommendations and guidelines contained in this resolution and should be required to:

- .1 make an assessment of the tasks, duties and responsibilities of the ship's complement required for its safe operation, for its security, for protection of the marine environment, and for dealing with emergency situations;
- .2 ensure that fitness for duty provisions and record of hours are implemented;
- .3 make an assessment of numbers and grades/capacities in the ship's complement required for its safe operation, for its security, for protection of the marine environment, and for dealing with emergency situations;
- .4 prepare and submit to the Administration a proposal for the minimum safe manning based upon the assessment of the numbers and grades/capacities in the ship's complement required for its safe operation, for its security and for protection of the marine environment, justifying the proposal by explaining how the proposed ship's complement will deal with emergency situations, including the evacuation of passengers, where necessary;
- .5 ensure that the minimum safe manning is adequate at all times and in all respects, including meeting peak workload situations, conditions and requirements, and is in accordance with the principles, recommendations and guidelines contained in this resolution; and
- .6 prepare and submit to the Administration a new proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship in the case of changes in trading area(s), construction, machinery, equipment, operation and maintenance or management of the ship, which may affect the safe manning.

#### **2 Approval by the Administration**

2.1 A proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship submitted by a company to the Administration should be evaluated by the Administration to ensure that:

- .1 the proposed ship's complement contains the number and grades/capacities of personnel to fulfil the tasks, duties and responsibilities required for the safe operation of the ship, for its security, for protection of the marine environment and for dealing with emergency situations; and

- .2 the master, officers and other members of the ship's complement are not required to work more hours than is safe in relation to the performance of their duties and the safety of the ship and that the requirements for work and rest hours, in accordance with applicable national regulations, can be complied with.

2.2 In applying such principles, Administrations should take proper account of existing IMO, ILO, ITU and WHO instruments in force which deal with:

- .1 watchkeeping;
- .2 hours of work or rest;
- .3 safety management;
- .4 certification of seafarers;
- .5 training of seafarers;
- .6 occupational health and hygiene;
- .7 crew accommodation;
- .8 security;
- .9 radiocommunications.

2.3 The Administration should require a company to amend a proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship if, after evaluation of the original proposal submitted by the company, the Administration is unable to approve the proposed composition of the ship's complement.

2.4 The Administration should only approve a proposal for the minimum safe manning of a ship and issue accordingly a minimum safe manning document if it is fully satisfied that the proposed ship's complement is established in accordance with the principles, recommendations and guidelines contained in this resolution, and is adequate in all respects for the safe operation and the security of the ship and for the protection of the marine environment.

2.5 The Administration may withdraw the minimum safe manning document of a ship if the company fails to submit a new proposal for the ship's minimum safe manning when changes in trading area(s), construction, machinery, equipment or operation and maintenance of the ship have taken place which affect the minimum safe manning.

2.6 The Administration should review and may withdraw, as appropriate, the minimum safe manning document of a ship which persistently fails to be in compliance with rest hours requirements.

2.7 The Administration should consider the circumstances very carefully before allowing a minimum safe manning document to contain provisions for less than three qualified officers in charge of a navigational watch, while taking into account all the principles for establishing safe manning.

\* \* \*

ANNEX 4

**GUIDANCE ON CONTENTS AND MODEL FORM OF  
MINIMUM SAFE MANNING DOCUMENT**

1 The following information should be included in the minimum safe manning document issued by the Administration specifying the minimum safe manning:

- .1 a clear statement of the ship's name, port of registry, distinctive number or letters, IMO number, gross tonnage, main propulsion power, type and trading area, whether or not the machinery space is unattended and company as defined in the ISM Code;
- .2 a table showing the number and grades/capacities of the personnel required to be carried, together with any special conditions or other remarks;
- .3 a formal statement by the Administration that, in accordance with the principles and guidelines set out in Annexes 1 and 2, the ship named in the document is considered to be safely manned if, whenever it proceeds to sea, it carries not less than the number and grades/capacities of personnel shown in the document, subject to any special conditions stated therein;
- .4 a statement as to any limitations on the validity of the document by reference to particulars of the individual ship and the nature of service upon which it is engaged; and
- .5 the date of issue and any expiry date of the document together with a signature for and the seal of the Administration.

2 It is recommended that the minimum safe manning document be drawn up in the form corresponding to the model given in the appendix to this annex. If the language used is not English, the information given should include a translation into English.

\* \* \*

APPENDIX

MODEL FORM OF MINIMUM SAFE MANNING DOCUMENT

MINIMUM SAFE MANNING DOCUMENT

(Official seal)

(State)

Issued under the provisions of regulation V/14(b) of the  
INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA, 1974, as amended

under the authority of the Government of

.....  
(name of the State)

by

.....  
(Administration)

*Particulars of ship*\*

Name of ship .....

Distinctive number or letters .....

IMO number .....

Port of registry .....

Gross tonnage:

National .....

International Tonnage Convention, 1969 .....

Main propulsion power (kW) .....

Type of ship .....

Periodically unattended machinery space                      yes/no

Operating Company .....

---

\* Alternatively the particulars of the ship may be placed horizontally.

Trading area**
----------------

The ship named in this document is considered to be safely manned if, when it proceeds to sea, it carries not less than the number and grades/capacities of personnel specified in the table(s) below.

Grade/capacity	Certificate (STCW regulation)	Number of persons

Special requirements or conditions, if any:
---

Issued at ..... on the ..... day of .....  
 (month and year)

Date of expiry (if any) .....

(Seal of the Administration)

.....  
 (Signature for and on behalf of the Administration)

\* \* \*

---

\*\* Where a trading area other than unlimited is shown, a clear description or map of the trading area should be included in the document.

## ANNEX 5

### FRAMEWORK FOR DETERMINING MINIMUM SAFE MANNING

#### Preamble

This framework has been developed to assist Administrations and companies in determining minimum safe manning.

#### Steps for determining minimum safe manning

##### 1 Submission from the company

1.1 submission of a proposal from the company for minimum safe manning defining the nature of the operation of the ship; and

1.2 submission needs to take into account the requirements of Annexes 2 and 3 in the context of the management of the safety, security and protection of the marine environment.

1.3 The process outlined below should enable companies to achieve greater depth and insight into the interdependencies and interactions of operational elements that influence the amounts of crew member workload and, ultimately, the proposed minimum safe manning level.

#### Operational functions

1.4 Beginning this process requires the breakdown of the operational elements into functions. Annex 2 provides guidance on the relevant functions that need to be considered, however, this list is not exclusive. Each function can then be broken down into a task list that includes the attributes listed below.

- .1 **Duration:** What is the time required to execute each task? Time in this case is measurement of total man hours versus the actual duration taken for task completion, since some tasks can be done in a shorter time by using multiple individuals.
- .2 **Frequency:** How often is the task performed? This can be categorized using some form of standard interval (i.e. hourly, daily, weekly, etc.).
- .3 **Competence:** What are the skills, training and qualifications needed to consistently perform the task properly?
- .4 **Importance:** What is the risk or consequence associated with improper performance?

### **Operational factors**

1.5 Once a function is broken down into specific tasks and their attributes, it is then necessary to determine the specific personnel qualifications, operational policy and procedures, and infrastructure/technology necessary to perform each task. It is important to recognize that these elements may increase or decrease manning levels depending on availability and appropriate procedures and of specific capability enabling technology/automation.

### **Task capability**

1.6 The information generated in defining the operational factors and functions should be used to determine how many tasks that can be executed by an individual under the possible range of operational conditions. Critical considerations, while conducting this step, are human element limitations and relevant standards and regulations. These include sleep and circadian requirements, physical and mental workload associated with each task, and exposure limits to shipboard environmental conditions such as noise, temperature and toxins.

### **Workload assessments**

1.7 Once steps relating to operational functions, operational factors and task capability have been conducted, the information is then used to determine whether workload will not exceed the minimum hours of rest and/or work as provided in relevant national and international regulations. Considerations, while performing this step, include work period lengths, work schedule designs and whether a single crew member can execute the tasks set in a specific work period or work period(s) per work day.

## **2 Evaluation by the Administration**

2.1 The Administration should evaluate/approve the submission of the company against relevant national and international regulatory requirements and guidelines.

2.2 Having evaluated and approved the proposal the Administration should issue a minimum safe manning document including special requirements and conditions [supported by minimum safe manning assessment].

## **3 Maintenance of minimum safe manning document**

A company should advise the Administration of any changes that would affect the minimum safe manning document, and in such circumstances prepare and submit a new proposal taking into account annex 3.

## **4 Compliance monitoring**

The Administration should periodically review the minimum safe manning arrangements.

\*\*\*

## ANNEX 6

**DRAFT REVISED WORK PROGRAMME OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE  
AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR STW 41**

		<b>Target completion date/number of sessions needed for completion</b>	<b>Reference</b>
1	<b>Validation of model training courses</b> <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5.2 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.2 <i>Planned output:</i> -	Continuous	STW 31/17, paragraph 14.4; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 3
2	<b>Casualty analysis</b> (coordinated by FSI) <i>Strategic direction:</i> 12.1 <i>High-level action:</i> 12.1.2 <i>Planned output:</i> 12.1.2.1 to .2	Continuous	MSC 77/26, paragraphs 18.10 and 23.40.2; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 10
H.1	<b>Unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency</b> <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5.2 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.1 <i>Planned output:</i> -	Continuous	MSC 71/23, paragraph 20.55.2; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 4
H.2	<b>Measures to enhance maritime security</b> <i>Strategic direction:</i> 6 <i>High-level action:</i> 6.3.2 <i>Planned output:</i> 6.3.2.1	2010	MSC 75/24, paragraphs 22.9 and 22.45; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 69
H.3	<b>Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code</b> <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.2 <i>Planned output:</i> 5.2.2.1	2010	STW 37/18, section 15; MSC 81/25, paragraphs 23.57.2, 23.40.2, 23.62 and 23.63; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 7; MSC 85/26, paragraph 23.46
.1	<b>chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.2	<b>chapter II of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		

- 
- Notes:**
- 1 “H” means high priority item and “L” means a low priority item. However, within the high and low priority groups, items have not been listed in any order of priority.
  - 2 Items printed in bold letters have been selected for the provisional agenda for STW 40.

**Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) (continued)**

		<b>Target completion date/number of sessions needed for completion</b>	<b>Reference</b>
.3	<b>chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.4	<b>chapter IV of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.5	<b>chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.6	<b>chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.7	<b>chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
.8	<b>chapter VIII of the STCW Convention and Code</b>		
H.4	<b>Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning level of ships including mandatory requirements for determining safe manning</b> (in co-operation with NAV) <i>Strategic direction: 5 and 12</i> <i>High-level action: 5.2.2 and 12.1.1</i> <i>Planned output: 5.2.2.2 and 12.1.2.1</i>	2010	MSC 81/25, paragraphs 23.58 to 23.60; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 8
H.5	Development of training standards for recovery systems <i>Strategic direction: 5.1</i> <i>High-level action: 5.1.2</i> <i>Planned output: -</i>	2 sessions	MSC 81/25, paragraph 23.64
H.6	<b>Training for seafarer safety representatives</b> <i>Strategic direction: 5.2</i> <i>High-level action: 5.2.2</i> <i>Planned output: -</i>	<del>2009</del> 2010	MSC 82/24, paragraph 21.23; STW <del>39/12</del> 40/14, section 5

**Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) (continued)**

		<b>Target completion date/number of sessions needed for completion</b>	<b>Reference</b>
H.7	Safety provisions applicable to tenders operating from passenger ships (coordinated by DE) <i>Strategic direction:</i> 12 <i>High-level action:</i> 12.1.2 <i>Planned output:</i> 12.1.2.1	3 sessions	MSC 84/24, paragraph 22.66
H.8	<del><b>Mandatory requirements for determining safe manning</b></del> (in cooperation with NAV, as necessary) <del><i>Strategic direction:</i> 12</del> <del><i>High-level action:</i> 12.1.2</del> <del><i>Planned output:</i> 12.1.2.1</del>	2010	MSC 84/24, paragraph 22.68
H.9-8	<b>Revision of the Recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships</b> (coordinated by DSC) <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5.2 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.3 <i>Planned output:</i> 5.2.3.2	2010	MSC 85/26, paragraph 23.7
H.10-9	<b>Development of an e-navigation strategy implementation plan</b> (coordinated by NAV) <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5.2 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.4 <i>Planned output:</i> -	4 sessions [2012]	MSC 85/26, paragraph 23.22
L.1	Review of the implementation of STCW chapter VII <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.2 <i>Planned output:</i> -	2 sessions	MSC 72/23, paragraph 21.56; STW 35/19, section 14

**Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) (continued)**

		<b>Target completion date/number of sessions needed for completion</b>	<b>Reference</b>
L.2	Clarification of the STCW-F Convention provisions and follow-up action to the associated Conference resolutions <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.1 <i>Planned output:</i> -	2 sessions	STW 34/14, paragraph 11.8
L.3	<b>[Development of model procedures for executing shipboard emergency measures]</b> <i>Strategic direction:</i> 5 <i>High-level action:</i> 5.2.2 <i>Planned output:</i> 5.2.2.2	<del>[2 sessions</del> 2011]	MSC 84/24, paragraph 22.67

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING (STW) – 41st SESSION\***

- Opening of the session
- 1 Adoption of the agenda
  - 2 Decisions of other IMO bodies
  - 3 Validation of model training courses
  - 4 Unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency
  - 5 Training for seafarer safety representatives
  - 6 Casualty analysis
  - 7 Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code:
    - .1 chapter I of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .2 chapter II of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .3 chapter III of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .4 chapter IV of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .5 chapter V of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .6 chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .7 chapter VII of the STCW Convention and Code
    - .8 chapter VIII of the STCW Convention and Code
  - 8 Review of the principles for establishing the safe manning level of ships including mandatory requirements for determining safe manning
  - 9 Measures to enhance maritime security
  - 10 Development of an e-navigation strategy implementation plan
  - 11 Revision of the Recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships
  - 12 Development of model procedures for executing shipboard emergency measures
  - 13 Work programme and agenda for STW 42

---

\* Agenda item numbers do not necessarily indicate priority.

- 14 Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2011
- 15 Any other business
- 16 Report to the Maritime Safety Committee

\*\*\*

## ANNEX 7

**STATUS OF PLANNED OUTPUT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL ACTION PLAN OF THE ORGANIZATION AND PRIORITIES  
FOR THE 2008-2009 BIENNIUM RELEVANT TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

Strategic Directions (SDs) (A.989(25))		High-level Actions (HLAs)		Planned outputs for 2008-2009			
<b>ENHANCING THE STATUS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF IMO</b>							
1	IMO is the primary international forum for technical matters of all kinds affecting international shipping and legal matters related thereto. An inclusive and comprehensive approach to such matters will be a hallmark of IMO. In order to maintain that primacy, it will:	1.1	Further develop its role in maritime affairs <i>vis-à-vis</i> other intergovernmental organizations, so as to be able to deal effectively and comprehensively with complex cross-agency issues	1.1.2	Co-operate with the United Nations and other international bodies on matters of mutual interest	1.1.2.2	Liaison statements issued to or from (MSC): ILO: seafarers' issues  <b>Status: Continuous</b>
				1.3.5	Harmonize IMO instruments with other relevant international instruments, as necessary	1.3.5.	Training standards for ratings in the STCW Convention and Code (transfer from ILO) (MSC)  <b>Status: Completed and to be adopted along with those amendments arising following the comprehensive review</b>
<i>The related performance indicators are: 1, 2, 3, 16, 17 and 19</i>							
<b>DEVELOPING AND MAINTAINING A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR SAFE, SECURE, EFFICIENT AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND SHIPPING</b>							
5	IMO's highest priority will be the safety of human life at sea. In particular, greater emphasis will be accorded to:	5.2	Enhancing technical, operational and safety management standards	5.2.2	Development and review of training and watchkeeping standards and operational procedures for maritime personnel	5.2.2.1	New or amended mandatory IMO instruments:  Safety and security topics (MSC): - Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code (MSC) (see Output 12.5.1.1)  <b>Status: In progress (target completion date 2010)</b>
						5.2.2.2	New or amended non-mandatory IMO instruments (MSC): Revised Principles of safe manning (resolution A.890(21))  <b>Status: In progress (target completion date 2010)</b>
<i>The related performance indicators are: 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12</i>							

Strategic Directions (SDs) (A.989(25))		High-level Actions (HLAs)		Planned outputs for 2008-2009			
<b>ENHANCING THE PROFILE OF SHIPPING AND INSTILLING A QUALITY CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIENCE</b>							
12	IMO will take the lead in enhancing the quality of shipping by:	12.5	Identifying, correlating and evaluating the factors, including human interaction on board ships, that influence safety and security culture, and developing practical and effective mechanisms to address them	12.5.1	Promote bridge resource management	12.5.1.1	Bridge resource management effectively addressed through comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code (MSC) (see Output 5.2.2.1 (safety and security topics))  <b>Status: In progress to be completed along with the Comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code (Target completion date 2010)</b>
<i>The related performance indicators are: 10, 11 and 12</i>							